RESEARCH BRIEF

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

An Overview of the Project

JEROME D. PAUKER, Principal Investigator
JACQUELINE DESNOYERS
ROSLYN PAUKER

This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario.
It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

Chris Ward, Minister
Bernard J. Shapiro, Deputy Minister

Ministry of Education
Ontario

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

An Overview of the Project

JEROME D. PAUKER, Principal Investigator
JACQUELINE DESNOYERS
ROSLYN PAUKER

This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario.

It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

Chris Ward, Minister
Bernard J. Shapiro, Deputy Minister

© QUEEN'S PRINTER FOR ONTARIO, 1988

Order information:

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6
(416) 926-4707

Will invoice on orders over $30.00.
Other orders must be accompanied by a cheque or money order payable to O.I.S.E.

MGS Publications Services
880 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8
(416) 965-6015
(Toll Free) 1-800-268-7540
(Toll Free from area code 807)
Ask operator for Zenith 67200.

Order must be accompanied by a cheque or money order payable to the Treasurer of Ontario.

Contract 0640
ON04699

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Pauker, Jerome D., 1925-
School attendance and non-attendance in Canada and the United States

(Research brief)
ISBN 0-7729-3546-7

1. School attendance—Canada. 2. School attendance—United States. I. Desnoyers, Jacqueline, 1944- . II. Pauker, Roslyn. III. Ontario. Ministry of Education. IV. Title. V. Series: Research brief (Ontario. Ministry of Education)

LC142.P38 1988 371.2'4 C88-099612-9

This project comprises five volumes. The following three are available on microfiche at MGS Publications Services.

"School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Review of the 1975-1986 Literature", ON04700
"School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Compulsory School Attendance Legislation", ON04701
"School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Classification of Male Young Offenders with School Attendance Problems", ON04702

Bound copies of the remaining two reports are available for sale from the Ontario Government Bookstore and the OISE Bookstore.

School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: An Overview of the Project (Research Brief)
School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Methods and Programs to Increase School Attendance, Decrease Absenteeism, and Deal with Drop-out

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface v
Introduction 1
Overview of Volume I. School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Review of the 1975-1986 Literature 3
Purpose 3
Method 3
Results and Discussion 3
Correlates of Non-attendance 4
Causes of Non-attendance 5
Intervention 5
Overview of Volume II. School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Compulsory School Attendance Legislation 9
Purpose 9
Method 10
Results and Discussion 11
The Scope of the Legislation 11
Exemptions to Compulsory Education 12
Enforcement - Attendance Officers 15
Enforcement Against Parents 16
Penalties 17
Court of Jurisdiction 18
Enforcement Against the Student 18
Statutory Alternatives 20
Conclusions 21
Overview of Volume III. School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Methods and Programs to Increase School Attendance, Decrease Absenteeism, and Deal with Drop-out 24
Purpose 24
Method 25
Results and Discussion 26
Attendance Tracking and Process 26
Attendance Recording and Reporting 26
Attendance Monitoring 27

Attendance Follow-up 27
Follow-up of School or School System Attendance Problems 28
Follow-up of Individual Attendance Problems 31
Current Research in Program Evaluation 31
Discussion 32
General Needs of a Good Attendance Program 32
Definitions 34
Early Identification 34
Attendance Counsellors 34
Overview of Volume IV. School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Classification of Male Young Offenders with School Attendance Problems 35
Purpose 35
Method 36
Results and Discussion 38
Principles 42
Recommendations 50
Appendices
A. Recommended Readings 59
B. Components of Compulsory School Attendance Statutes 62
C. Provinces/Territories/States Which Replied to the Second Inquiry Re Attendance Statutes 64
D. Summary of Ontario Compulsory Attendance Statutes 65
E. Summary of Canadian Compulsory Attendance Statutes 69
F. Summary of United States Compulsory Attendance Statutes 73
G. Persons Met With, Phoned, or Otherwise Contacted in the Course of the Programs Survey 86

PREFACE

A number of persons helped in a variety of ways on this project. Their contributions to the individual studies which make up the project are acknowledged in the overviews of each of the parts.

The project, which includes the four studies, was conducted under a contract between the principal investigator (J.D.P.) and the Ontario Ministry of Education, which provided the funds.

This report reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the ministry.

INTRODUCTION

This project on school non-attendance was conducted over approximately a two-year period (1985-1987). It consists of four studies and their respective reports (listed below, with their respective authors). The four studies obviously relate to each other, but have different foci and purposes:

School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Review of the 1975-1986 Literature (Jerome D. Pauker).

Focus: the school attendance literature.

Purpose: to provide an overview of published thinking, research, and applications, in the identification, prevention, and remediation of non-attendance, and to make available an indexed and annotated source-book of abstracts.

School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Compulsory School Attendance Legislation (Roslyn Pauker and Jerome D. Pauker).

Focus: school attendance legislation.

Purpose: to detail, summarize, and give examples of Canadian and United States attendance statutes.

School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Survey of Methods and Programs to Increase School Attendance, Decrease Absenteeism, and Deal with Drop-out (Jacqueline Desnoyers and Jerome D. Pauker).

Focus: North American programs of intervention.

Purpose: to provide the range of current North American practices in keeping children in school and in furthering the education of those who have left school before completing their education.

School Attendance and Non-attendance in Canada and the United States: Classification of Male Young Offenders with School Attendance Problems (Jerome D. Pauker).

Focus: the relationship of selected aspects of personality to school attendance.

Purpose: to investigate how personal characteristics and school non-attendance may be related.

The purposes, methods, and findings of each of these studies will be summarized in this report, followed by the principles and recommendations which derive from them.[1,2]

---

[1]The complete reports of each of the four studies are available on microfiche from the Ontario Government Bookstore. A printed copy of the third report on the survey of methods and programs may be purchased from the Ontario Government Bookstore and the OISE bookstore.

[2]This overview differs somewhat from the four complete reports on the separate parts of the project, in the following respects: (1) the table of studies in the first volume has been modified slightly in its organization; (2) some of the principles and recommendations are articulated more clearly than they are in the separate reports, and some derive from subsequent consideration of the reports both singly and combined.

OVERVIEW OF VOLUME I. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES: REVIEW OF THE 1975-1986 LITERATURE

Jerome D. Pauker, B.A., M.S., Ph.D.

Purpose

The purpose of this survey is to organize the 1975-1986 literature on school attendance and non-attendance in a way which makes it more accessible to persons who make education policy, do education research, teach and train education workers, and engage in the practice of education in the schools.

Method

Computerized literature data bases and several other resources were searched for articles, books, and doctoral dissertations related to such keywords as school attendance, absence, absenteeism, non-attendance, truancy, and drop-out. An abstract was written for each piece of literature (in some instances incorporating parts or all of the abstracts provided by the authors of the article or by abstracting services), and a number of the abstracts were annotated with comments which emphasize particularly significant points, provide clarification, offer alternative views, or indicate deficiencies in design or method. A subject index was constructed.

Results and Discussion

The complete report for Volume I provides 628 abstracts, many of them with annotations, plus an index of 437 topic headings.

The diversity of content and type of the 628 pieces of literature precluded an all-inclusive critical review for this project. Instead, comments are directed at three broad areas (correlates of non-attendance; causes of non-attendance; interventions), recommendations are made regarding research (see Recommendations), and recommended reading is listed (see Appendix A).

Correlates of non-attendance

Almost 200 correlates of non-attendance appear in the literature covered. The following are noted to be associated with non-attendance in four or more papers:

- age (non-attenders are older).
- low or poorer self-esteem/self-concept.
- antisocial problems/antisocial behaviour/delinquency.
- behaviour problems in school/disruptive in school.
- lower school grades/poor student/educational problems/ lower achievement/poor academic performance/retention in grade.
- poorer in mathematics.
- poorer in reading.
- less involvement in extracurricular activities.
- more negative attitudes toward school/school alienation.
- lower socioeconomic status.

In these and in other findings of studies which look at what is associated with non-attendance, as well as in studies which look at what non-attendance is associated with, it is evident that non-attenders appear to be at a disadvantage educationally, socially, emotionally, and economically. However, there are other studies, though fewer, which report results that do not support some of the above findings and which even are opposite to them.

These apparent contradictions in findings are not surprising considering the variations among studies in sizes of samples, geographical areas from which study subjects are drawn, subjects' ages, subjects' school grade levels, kinds of schools, family structures, socioeconomic status, sex of subjects, kinds of research design, and purposes and foci of the studies. The correlates, then, hold for many groups of students, but not necessarily for all, and, even where they do hold, their relative importance may vary.

It is apparent, also, that the relationship between non-attendance and any single correlate usually is not very large. In fact, characteristics which distinguish groups of attenders from groups of non-attenders are found to occur in significant numbers of individuals in both groups. (The implications of this for program planning at different organizational levels are discussed in the Recommendations section in this report. It can be said here that an intervention program which may make sense for a school or for a school board/district may not be appropriate for selected individuals in that area.)

Causes of non-attendance

Truancy and other non-attendance have been attributed to kinds of child or adolescent, characteristics of parents, structures of families, kinds of homes, education curricula, teacher attitudes, classroom and school environments, school organization, and social, economic, political, and employment conditions. However, few studies adequately approach the question of cause(s) of non-attendance. Most presumed causes are inferred from correlates of non-attendance rather than demonstrated to have played a role in its occurrence. Correlates by themselves demonstrate only a relationship and cannot be considered to be causes unless specifically demonstrated to be so.

From what is known about complex behaviours, it seems unlikely that there is any one cause of non-attendance or that any one presumed cause will have an equal effect on all students or on all kinds of non-attendance.

Intervention

A large number of the studies of the effects of interventions can be categorized on the basis of whether the intervention was meant to have a direct impact on school attendance behaviour (e.g., rewards to children for school attendance; phone calls to parents whose children were absent from school) or whether the intervention was related only indirectly to attendance behaviour (e.g., counselling to increase self-esteem; a change in

curriculum). The studies could be subgrouped further on the basis of whether the intervention made use of a behavioural method (e.g., contracts between students and teachers, including rewards for contracted behaviours) or a non-behavioural method (e.g., non-directive group counselling). The table below presents the percentages of these interventions which result in increased attendance or in no significant change.

It can be seen from the table that a larger percentage of those interventions that are focused directly on attendance behaviour have positive results than do the indirect interventions (85.0% versus 44.3%, respectively), that behavioural interventions do better than other kinds of interventions (81.1% versus 47.9%, respectively; these percentages are derived from the figures in the table, but are not listed in it), and that those interventions which are both behavioural and directed at attendance behaviour do the best of all (89.7%).

Several considerations must be kept in mind, however, before concluding from these findings that the only way to manage non-attendance is to design an intervention which is both behavioural and aimed directly at attendance behaviour.

A. The data in the table are the result of a simple count, with no consideration given to the adequacy of the design, the extent of the outcome, or how long the effects were maintained (in a number of the studies, some or all of this information could not be ascertained from the reported findings).

B. Although the ratio of successes (increased attendance) to failures does not look as good for the table cells with interventions <u>not</u> directed at attendance behaviour as it does for those which are so directed, success is still reported for a considerable percentage of those interventions.

C. In some intervention studies, the target subjects were not non-attenders, as usually thought of, but rather the general school population of students, or subjects selected on the basis of some characteristic or problem other than non-attendance (e.g., poor achievement).

Percentage of Intervention Studies (N = 110 Studies) Reporting Positive Results or No Change in Attendance, by Behaviour Directed Toward and by Type of Intervention

	Intervention						
	Addressed Directly to School Attendance Behaviour			Addressed Indirectly to School Attendance Behaviour			
Results	Behavioural (29 studies)	Other (11 studies)	Subtotal (40 studies)	Behavioural (8 studies)	Other (62 studies)	Subtotal (70 studies)	Total (110 studies)
Positive	89.7	72.7	85.0	50.0	43.5	44.3	59.1
No Change	10.3	27.3	15.0	50.0	56.5	55.7	40.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

D. The definitions of non-attendance which guided subject selection (in those studies in which non-attenders were the target subjects) varied considerably from study to study.

E. Non-attenders were treated, for the most part, as though they were a homogeneous, undifferentiated group.

F. Many of the study designs do not permit identification of which of several intervention elements is the one (or are the ones) effecting increases in attendance.

G. The fact that there was an increase in attendance does not necessarily mean that the increased time in school was beneficial for the students involved.

OVERVIEW OF VOLUME II. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES: SURVEY OF COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE LEGISLATION[3]

Roslyn Pauker, B.Sc., LL.B.
and
Jerome D. Pauker, B.A., M.S., Ph.D.

Purpose

Many of the North American education laws are undergoing revision, as is true of Ontario's Education Act, and the sections having to do with compulsory school attendance have been under review. In Ontario, the Education Act specifies that adjudicated truants be dealt with according to the sentencing provisions of the Canadian Juvenile Delinquents Act, but the elimination of status offences from the more recent Canadian Young Offenders Act (which replaced the J.D.A.) has meant that the dispositions formerly available to the courts are now in question.

The purpose of Volume II of the research project is to provide a survey and overview of compulsory school attendance legislation in North America.

---

[3]The first author (R.P.) of the legislation survey was not involved in the initial planning for the survey nor in the composition of the first letter of inquiry to the Ministries and Departments of Education in Canada and the United States. She subsequently organized the initial survey returns, did the law library searches, formulated the questions for the follow-up inquiries, and drafted the report for Volume II.

Method

Letters asking for information about truancy legislation were sent to Ministries and Departments of Education in 63 North American jurisdictions (10 provinces, 2 Territories, 50 States, and the District of Columbia). Replies were received from most of them. Law libraries in the Toronto area and in the United States were used to fill in information about jurisdictions which had not replied to our inquiries or for which the information supplied was lacking in some respect.

A list of 19 components of compulsory school attendance legislation was devised and used to organize the information and to write a summary for each of the 63 North American jurisdictions (see list and explanation in Appendix B). Because one or another of the 19 components could not be determined clearly for all of the sources, and because changes in North American education law had occurred between the time of our mailed inquiry and the receipt of our last reply, we mailed a second inquiry in the spring and summer of 1986. This second mailing included, for each jurisdiction, the summary of its legislation, and we asked for verification or correction and for clarification. We asked, also, for copies of any other provisions or of recent amendments to the statutes, administrative codes, or regulations, which might have been overlooked. In some instances we made telephone calls to supplement the information we received in the mail.

Again, we received a very generous response from a large majority of the jurisdictions. (Those jurisdictions which were kind enough, and which were able to find the time, to respond to our second inquiry are noted in Appendix C.)

Using the information from the replies to the two letters of inquiry, the law library searches, and the telephone contacts, the 19 components of compulsory school attendance law were recompiled for each of the 63 jurisdictions and were included in the complete report for Volume II. In addition, the information for each of the 19 components, across the Canadian and the U.S. jurisdictions, was laid out in briefer form in two tables.

Results and Discussion

An example of the individual jurisdiction summaries provided in the complete report for Volume II is presented (for Ontario) in Appendix D. The two tables which provide the briefer summaries for Canada and the United States, respectively, of each of the 19 components for each of the jurisdictions, are presented in Appendices E and F.

In the presentation which follows, references are made to the statutes of individual Canadian and U.S. jurisdictions as examples of the diversity in legislation or as illustrations of interesting and promising approaches to the legislative regulation of attendance and non-attendance.[4]

The Scope of the Legislation

Education is compulsory in all 63 jurisdictions, reflecting the consensus that children within specified age limits should be receiving instruction, either in a formal classroom setting or by some other means subject to the control of the educational authority.

The scope of public education is much wider, of course, than that of compulsory attendance in the schools. Most school laws provide that the public schools serve a specific age population, either up to a given maximum age or through high school, but a surprising number, seven U.S. states and three jurisdictions in Canada, either are silent or give no upper age limit to the scope of public education. Twenty-five states and five provinces specify that free public schooling must be given to all persons through age 20, and one state and one province through age 21, and two states provide more generous free schooling to special education than to regular students.

---

[4]Many of these examples and illustrations appear also in the appendices of the complete report for Volume II in the form of excerpts from the statutes themselves.

The age limits of compulsory attendance range from 6 to 16 in Canada, and from 5 to 18 in the United States. Eight jurisdictions in Canada, and thirty-two in the United States, provide for education through age 15. Eight states require attendance until age 17, and nine until age 18, but none, with the exception of Mississippi, exempt all children over 15 as do four Canadian jurisdictions. Two provinces, Alberta and Manitoba, and four states, Illinois, Vermont, Wisconsin and Texas, subject children over school-leaving age to the attendance laws if they are enrolled in regular classes, and several similarly cover children younger than the lower age limits. In addition, there are varying requirements for attendance at part-time classes for children who are employed, or who have not completed their elementary education, or who are not fluent in English. Part-time attendance, with the exception of California, is conditional upon the local availability of such instruction. California extends compulsory education to persons between the ages of 16 and 18, requiring a minimum of four hours instruction per week.

In general, the statutes (1) set out the group affected, (2) specify the age requirements, and (3) list the exemptions and exclusions to compulsory attendance.

The most common upper age limit, 16 years, may not represent an optimal level of formal education. On the other hand, when viewed in the context of apprenticeship and training programs, an age 16 limit at least insists on education until the child is eligible for full-time employment. In addition, the desirability of further formal education must be balanced against the difficulty of enforcement as the allowed school-leaving age increases. A number of jurisdictions have attempted to balance these factors by providing for flexible alternative programs both within and outside of the public schools. Only programs which are statutorily mandated are discussed in this survey.

Statutory Exemptions to Compulsory Attendance

We have divided statutory exemptions to the compulsory attendance requirements into seven sections.

Completion of grade. One might expect that completion of high school or Grade 12 explicitly would result in the student's exemption, but that is so, in fact, only for 26 states and eight provinces. Three states provide exemption after completion of Grade 10, and three after completion of Grade 8. In jurisdictions where the compulsory attendance upper age limits are 16 years or older and there are no provisions for exemption after completion of Grade 12, a student who had completed high school still might be subject, theoretically, at least, to the compulsory attendance laws, a curious result.

Home instruction. All of the Canadian jurisdictions and 28 U.S. states exempt children who are educated at home. Ten states have no exclusion, specifically including children receiving instruction at home in the sections mandating compulsory attendance, and the statutes of the remaining thirteen states are silent. Presumably, in those jurisdictions where there is no exclusion, the student remains subject to requirements for daily attendance, while students who are excluded are subject to the varying provisions of the terms of the exclusion. The Canadian statutes do not spell out the conditions of home instruction, requiring only that the school authorities certify that instruction is "adequate" or "efficient" or "equivalent" to that of the public schools. In contrast, a number of U.S. states offer detailed requirements: ten with regard to the teaching qualifications of the parent or tutor, fourteen with regard to the subjects taught, eight with regard to the number of hours of days of instruction and eight with regard to testing to measure the student's educational progress.

Private schooling. Eleven provinces and territories and 25 states exempt students who attend private schools, usually with some provision for provincial or state approval of the private institution. Newfoundland is the Canadian exception, in that "school", for the purposes of the School Attendance Act, includes both public and private schools. The Canadian statutes do not detail the requirements for approval of private schools. Saskatchewan requires that the private schools provide a basic

program and course of study as in the public schools, and of the other provinces, five specify "efficient" instruction and three others ask only for "equivalent", "adequate", or "satisfactory" education, leaving the provincial and local school authorities wide discretion with regard to approval. In the United States, similarly, only a few states actually list required courses, although ten require "comparable" or "equivalent" instruction to that in the public schools. Texas schools must offer a course in good citizenship.

Work release. Six provinces provide for some form of work release, three, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and British Columbia, specifying the ages, 12, 14, and 15, respectively, at which students may be excused. Manitoba forbids the employment of students during school hours. The remaining Canadian jurisdictions have no provisions regarding early school leaving; whether, in practice, students are excused for paid employment is beyond the scope of this survey. In the United States, only Louisiana expressly forbids employment of students during school hours. Seventeen states have no employment provision and 33 allow some form of work release. The ages for which work permits may be given, where specified by statute, range from 12 to 16 years.

Incapacity. In Canada, excusal for incapacity is authorized only in Nova Scotia; in Alberta, only until special education facilities are available; and in Prince Edward Island, only for those children for whom special education is provided. The Ontario Education Act provides that a handicap is not, of itself, an unavoidable cause of absence. Forty-three states excuse children on the ground of incapacity, usually requiring medical evidence or certification of the child's inability to attend school.

Excusal by local authority, and other. The last two categories of excusals describe both mandatory and locally determined excusals, as well as any other grounds for which provincial or state officials are granted discretionary authority. The most common ground, mentioned in ten Canadian statutes, is "illness or other unavoidable cause", a phrase which

allows the local authority maximum discretion. For greater certainty, nine jurisdictions specifically excuse students who are under suspension or who have been expelled, six allow absence for religious observance, and five have some provision to excuse students who live more than a given distance from their school and who do not have access either to public transportation or to a school bus. In the Northwest Territories, a student may be excused to "participate in traditional native activities on the land". Statutes in the United States often require local trustees to set attendance policies, sometimes specifying that such policies follow state guidelines. Where grounds for excusal are listed, illness is always included. Religious observance is a ground for excusal in fifteen states, religious instruction in thirteen, suspension or expulsion in nine, and distance from school in nine. Unavoidable cause, or "impracticable" attendance is mentioned in eleven states. Alaska and Colorado excuse students who are in the custody of a law enforcement agency. Michigan, Georgia and Indiana excuse students employed as pages in the State Legislature, and Indiana also excuses students for service in the National Guard and for work at the polls on Election Day.

Enforcement - Attendance Officers

The use of attendance officers to enforce the compulsory attendance laws is customary, but not universal. Five Canadian provinces, Alberta, British Columbia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, do not appoint attendance officers, per se, although Alberta specifies the duties of the employee of the school board who "has the responsibility of enforcing" the compulsory attendance provisions. British Columbia provides that the classroom teacher shall enquire into pupils' absences and that the school board shall enforce the law. In Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the school investigates absences and the superintendent must recommend prosecution or other action against violators. Quebec requires that the principal report absences to the board, which is then responsible for investigation. Of the

Canadian jurisdictions in which there is statutory provision for appointment of attendance officers, Ontario and Saskatchewan list their duties in detail. In Saskatchewan the enumerated duties are not exclusive and the local attendance counsellor investigates in accordance with procedures approved by the local board of education. In the United States, only three states, Idaho, New Mexico and Kansas, do not have statutory provision for attendance officers. Idaho vests the local board of trustees with responsibility for initiating proceedings against violators, as does New Mexico, which, in addition, requires the governing bodies of private schools to enforce the attendance of their students. Kansas provides that the schools shall report absences directly to the Secretary of Social and Rehabilitation Services, the agency which is responsible for both the investigation and resolution of truancy problems. The remaining states all have some provision for the appointment of attendance officers, referred to variously as "truancy officers", "directors of pupil personnel" and "supervisors of attendance". Thirty-five states list the officers' duties by statute, while six states delegate authority to prescribe the duties and procedures of their attendance officers to local school authorities.

Enforcement Against Parent

In all legislation, the child's parents or guardians are responsible, sometimes jointly in the case of the older student, for the child's enrolment and attendance. We have surveyed the statutory provisions governing notice, penalties, and jurisdiction against parents who wilfully violate the compulsory attendance laws, in an attempt to get some sense of the legislative approach to sanctions: are the penalties meaningful, does the parent have proper notice, and is the court having jurisdiction one before which the truant child also could appear.

Notice is mandated by statute in half the Canadian jurisdictions. In the United States, perhaps reflecting the American emphasis on due process, only ten states do not mention that notice of violation must be given to the parent. Of those

that do have notice provisions, seven allow one day to cure the offence, seven allow three, and six specify a longer period. The absence of a mandatory notice section should not be construed, of course, to imply that the parent is not, in practice, given any warning of impending prosecution for failure to ensure the child's attendance.

Penalties. Penalties for violation in Canada vary from $10.00 for each day's unauthorized absence in British Columbia to a $500.00 maximum fine in Manitoba. Four provinces provide for increased penalties for subsequent violations, and in the Yukon, a violation of a previous court order for the child's attendance may result in a fine of up to $250.00 for each day's absence. Six jurisdictions allow imposition of a jail sentence, either in place of or in addition to a fine, and six jurisdictions provide that the parent may avoid penalty by posting a bond to ensure compliance.

Penalties in the United States range from Pennsylvania's $2.00 (for a first offence) to a maximum fine of $1,000.00 in Utah, Indiana, Mississippi, Nevada and Vermont and $2,500 in Kansas, which, until 1986, did not provide for any penalty at all. Contributing to a child's misconduct is now a Class A misdemeanour in Kansas. Ten states provide for increased penalties upon conviction for a subsequent offence; in South Dakota the maximum fine is $100.00 for a first and $1,000.00 for a second offence. Three states allow the offender to avoid penalty by posting a bond to ensure compliance, and, in place of the usual penalty, Colorado provides that the court may issue an order, the violation of which is contempt, punishable by a fine or imprisonment. Rhode Island, in addition to a fine, imprisonment or equitable relief, provides for an alternative civil procedure for injunctive relief. Thirty-five states provide for a jail sentence, either as an alternative or in addition to a monetary penalty against the parent. Two states provide neither fines nor imprisonment: Idaho provides for the institution of neglect proceedings against the parent; and in Delaware, it is possible to charge the parent for endangering the

welfare of the child through educational neglect. It should also be noted that ten states, in addition to Delaware and Idaho, do define neglect as a failure of the parent to provide education as required by law, but whether the parent is actually prosecuted for neglect in those states is not apparent from the legislation itself.

Court of Jurisdiction. Three provinces provide for proceedings to take place in the same court which would have jurisdiction over the child. In the United States, 17 states provide for proceedings against the parent of the truant to take place in a juvenile or family court. As much of the legislation recognizes, truancy is seldom simply a matter between authorities and the student, or between the authorities and the parent, and there may well be an advantage, if the child's non-attendance ultimately is dealt with in the courts, to have all parties to the problem present and to have all aspects of the problem resolved in a single proceeding. New legislation in New Mexico addresses this issue directly, by providing for training seminars for magistrates.

Enforcement Against the Student

The penalties authorized by statute against the truant student are listed in the subcategory 6(a). Suspension is mentioned here only when it is expressly provided for in the legislation, although the principal's authority to discipline a student for violation of the school discipline code usually is granted elsewhere in the statute. Similarly, referral to court, generally a family or juvenile court, is listed only when the statute expressly provides for referral or prosecution, although if, for example, truancy is a ground for delinquency or dependency, the school or other authority presumably would have been granted such authority elsewhere.

In Canada, three jurisdictions, Ontario, Saskatchewan and the Yukon, specifically authorize suspension of the persistently non-attendant student. Three jurisdictions, Newfoundland, the Northwest Territories, and Prince Edward Island, require the

principal to report absences to the superintendent or attendance counsellor for further action, and Nova Scotia provides for referral of the child to the Family Court.

Referral to court is the most commonly provided sanction against the truant student in the United States, listed in twenty-four statutes. Five states provide for suspension, and eight for expulsion, an unequivocal remedy for truancy; seven impose an academic penalty, and ten provide for attendance at alternative classes.

Under Canada's Young Offenders Act, which removes status offences from the definition of delinquency, disposition of truancy cases in the courts is limited to the provincial acts governing children in need of care and to the educational statutes themselves.

Ontario's Education Act retains the section which provides penalties for truancy as specified in the former Juvenile Delinquents Act, even though truancy no longer is a delinquent act. The Yukon Territory School Act states that it is the child's duty to attend school and defines a child in need of guidance as one who has committed a provincial offence. Failure to participate in a court-ordered diversion program subjects the child to prosecution in the same manner as under the Young Offenders Act, that is, the procedural protections of the Y.O.A. apply. Penalties in Ontario are limited by the Provincial Offences Act and one assumes that the corresponding limitation applies in the Yukon. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland define a child in need of protection as including one who is in the care of a person who has failed to provide for the child's education. Quebec defines a child whose security and development are in danger as including one who does not attend or who is frequently absent from school. The Nova Scotia Education Act also allows a court-ordered assessment prior to either an order requiring attendance or adjudication as a child in need of protection. New Brunswick provides either for prosecution of the child for a violation of the attendance laws or for adjudication as a child whose security or development is in danger. Six

Canadian jurisdictions, however, have no provision for court proceedings involving the child; apparently they have rejected the concept of the courts as a last resort in dealing with truancy.

Only two American states are inclined to abandon a court-ordered solution to non-attendance. Twenty-three states provide that a non-attending child may be found to be "delinquent", "unruly", "undisciplined", "beyond control", "truant", "incorrigible", "wayward", or a "status offender". Eleven states allow the child to be adjudicated a "child in need of services" or a "child in need of protection", or a "dependent child", or to be part of a "family in crisis" or a "family with service needs". Thirteen states may find that the child is neglected or in need of supervision. Three states specify that the court may order the child to attend, and one, California, provides that the court may assume wardship, effective only during school hours, over the truant child.

Statutory Alternatives

We have included in statutory alternatives to court action all mandatory efforts to solve the problem of non-attendance. Some of the provisions are extremely simple, such as the Quebec requirement that the attendance officer shall make use of "persuasion". Others are complex and detailed provisions of escalating actions which must be undertaken before initiating proceedings against the truant student.

Five Canadian jurisdictions offer statutory alternatives. The Northwest Territories provides for a formal inquiry into persistent non-attendance. The Yukon Children's Act establishes a Diversion Committee to approve individual programs for violators of provincial acts. Ontario has a supervised alternative learning program for students aged 14 to 16. Saskatchewan requires its attendance counsellors to consult with the appropriate social agencies in order to resolve the problems of the non-attending student.

Twenty-six U.S. states offer alternatives of some form. The Florida Code provides that before filing a petition of dependency, a series of activities, which may consist of meetings, counselling, psychological evaluation, or alternate educational programs, is carried out by the school authorities. Only if all efforts to remediate the problem have failed shall the dependency petition proceed.

In the Maine Education Code, habitual truancy is defined and the procedure to be followed in dealing with the truant is described. If informal efforts by the superintendent to solve the problem are unsuccessful, the school board shall call a hearing into the matter. The board has the power to release the child from attendance or to instruct the child to attend.

Utah requires the local boards of education to make "earnest and persistent" efforts to resolve a child's attendance problems, including conferences, establishment of alternative programs, and enlisting the assistance of community agencies. The section does not refer to prosecution, but does mention that the school board has authority, previously granted, to expel or release the child from school.

Wisconsin concisely defines truancy, provides for a written attendance policy, specifies the duties of attendance officers, and then sets out a series of activities which must be followed prior to proceeding against either the child or the parent. The activities listed are similar to those provided in the Florida Code, but are described in less detail.

Conclusions

The scope and variety of the legislation surveyed in this study should be apparent from this brief analysis. The statutes offer models, both in form and in content, for several different approaches to compulsory attendance. Some are very brief, allowing local school districts to formulate their own policies or, alternatively, providing centralized direction by way of regulation rather than through the statute itself. Others are

extremely detailed, reflecting the Legislature's particular concerns in a given area.

The authors believe that, whatever the substantive content of the legislation, school attendance laws should be drafted having regard to four areas of concern.

Firstly, non-attendance is not an isolated problem, and cannot be dealt with legally as though it were. Truancy interfaces with other societal problems of children and families. Remedies and sanctions must be consonant with other legislation, both provincial/state and federal, civil and criminal, so that the disposition of the chronic truant or the punishment of the recalcitrant parent, for example, are determined by the same criteria in the best interests of the child.

Secondly, attendance law is an integral part of school legislation. The age requirements, exemptions from compulsory attendance, length of school day and year, work release provisions and disciplinary procedures interact and should be considered as a whole. Changing one section without careful study of the effects on other aspects of attendance could well have unintended results.

Thirdly, mandated programs dealing with non-attendance raise issues of local direction and control, and the competing values of uniformity and flexibility, centralization and autonomy must be reconciled.

Fourthly, and underlying all the above, are the political and philosophical decisions which, ultimately, will be made by the Legislature. We suggest that the coherence and effectiveness of attendance legislation rests on a consensus regarding certain basic issues. What future do we envision for our children? Do we want to provide them only with an academic education, or with work skills, or with both? Do we treat all children alike, or do we offer them many options? How vital to society is the education of children, and is compulsory school attendance the best way to achieve that education? Further, what sanctions are most likely to encourage compliance with the law, given the nature of the offence?

It is not the purpose of this report to answer these questions, but it is hoped that this survey will be of value to those who are entrusted with the duty and opportunity to do so.

OVERVIEW OF VOLUME III. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES: SURVEY OF METHODS AND PROGRAMS TO INCREASE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, DECREASE ABSENTEEISM, AND DEAL WITH DROP-OUT[5]

Jacqueline Desnoyers, B.A., B.Ed., M.Ed.
and
Jerome D. Pauker, B.A., M.S., Ph.D.

Purpose

The literature on school attendance, non-attendance, and drop-out (Volume I) includes descriptions of methods and programs for promoting attendance, preventing non-attendance, and dealing with non-attendance problems when they arise. The approaches range from methods designed to help an individual child with a specific attendance problem, to programs aimed at the student bodies of entire school systems. The former approaches usually are well documented as to results, but raise questions regarding issues of generalizability and applicability for school boards grappling with system-wide problems; the latter approaches as reported in the literature, generally are not evaluated in any helpful way.

For Ontario, which is adjusting to the changes in federal criminal law that have dropped truancy as an offence, and is rewriting its compulsory attendance statutes while trying to find more effective ways of helping young people to benefit from the education system, there may be much to be gained by a look at the variety of current attempts in Canada and the United States to

---

[5]We wish here to express our gratitude for the cooperation, helpfulness, and hospitality with which our visits and requests for information were received. We have listed in Appendix G most of those with whom we made contact. It is very possible that we have not included a name, or that we have misidentified a place; if that has happened, we apologize for the oversight. We wish also to express our appreciation for the contribution of Seppo Nousiainen, who offered many valuable suggestions for keeping the contents of the complete Volume III report focused and clear.

to deal with what many see as an increasingly serious attendance problem.

Method

Potential sources of program information were identified from the correspondence with North American legislative jurisdictions (Volume II), from recommendations by personal contacts, from references in the literature, and from reports at professional meetings.

On-site visits were made to 29 cities in 6 Canadian provinces, 13 U.S. states, and the U.S. District of Columbia. Some of the contacts were very brief, while the longest lasted for nine hours. Other information was gathered by telephone and by mail. There also was some correspondence with Europeans, as well as a short exchange with two visitors, a school psychologist and a special educator, from the U.S.S.R. Although plans originally called for a section on European legislation and programs, this had to be dropped because it would have required extensive translation and because our information was not complete.

In the end, we met with, spoke with by phone, or exchanged correspondence with the persons who are listed in Appendix G. Most of these were in-person contacts. Although the list is long, it is far from being exhaustive, and it was by no means systematically engendered. Indeed, we came upon some of the people and programs serendipitously. There are other persons and programs we would have liked to contact, but did not have the time for, and we are certain that there are other, exemplary programs of which we are unaware. Nevertheless, we do believe that we have sampled from a wide enough geographical area, and from enough programs and knowledgeable persons, that our survey represents a fair overview of the range of current interventions and current thinking in North America.

As we spoke with or otherwise corresponded with our information sources, we had no formal interview plan or set of

questions. Our initial inquiries were directed to the following: (1) what programs and methods are in operation, and why; (2) what is being planned, and why; (3) what kinds of evaluation have been done, are in progress, or are in planning.

Results and Discussion

In order to present in coherent form the mass of information given to us in our meetings and provided to us in various printed materials, we settled on a framework which is organized broadly around several processes or areas, as follows:

A. attendance tracking process and components.
B. follow-up process and components.
   1. school system
   2. individual.
C. program evaluation.

We did not attempt to present in the Volume III report all of the information we gathered. Rather, with the elaboration of the above framework and the presentation of examples, we provide what we believe to be a true representation of the current state of school attendance affairs in North America.

A. Attendance Tracking Process. There are three components to attendance tracking: recording, reporting, and monitoring.

1. **Attendance recording and reporting.** The most common recording method is daily record keeping by classroom teachers. In many schools, the responsibility for notifying parents and guardians of student absence has been transferred to a central office, which may make use of an automatic telephone dialing and message service. Many schools provide a cumulative attendance profile on each student for monitoring purposes, in addition to keeping overall statistics on student enrolment, absenteeism, and drop-out. These statistics may be reported to both school personnel and central

administrative staff, who are apprised of any changes in absenteeism or drop-out trends.

2. **Attendance monitoring**. Some school boards and districts monitor (1) the type of absence (excused or unexcused), and (2) the number of times that the absence occurred. Some provincial/state and local jurisdictions incorporate definitions and standards into their statements of attendance policies. Many local school systems identify students who they believe are potential drop-outs; predictors used may include school progress, number of absences, standardized and local competency test scores, age, number of suspensions, and other characteristics. Names of potential drop-outs are forwarded to local schools for closer monitoring and for initiation of intervention. There is a trend for more senior levels of school administration to be involved in the monitoring of student attendance. Plans in some jurisdictions include the use of individual student identification numbers for all students in a province or state, and codes which identify the current attendance status of the student (e.g., attending, suspended, dropped out, re-enrolled).

B. Attendance Follow-up[6]. The follow-up process involves an assessment to determine factors contributing to the absenteeism and to initiate some type of intervention to resolve the problem. Two levels of follow-up can be distinguished, one at the school

---

[6]The term follow-up is used here, as it is understood in education, to refer to what is done after an issue or problem has been identified. For purposes of this study, follow-up incorporates both assessment and intervention processes and procedures. For example, in the case of a child who is identified as being a poor attender, follow-up might include a home visit which locates a source of difficulty in an ill, single parent who needs to have the student at home to take care of an infant child (assessment), and the referral of the family to a community welfare agency (intervention).

or school system level and one at the individual student level (though many programs cut across levels).

1. **Follow-up of school or school system attendance problems**. We found a variety of kinds of intervention, and approaches to intervention, that are used by schools and school systems:

   a. **staff training and development** - may involve in-service training programs covering a variety of attendance-related topics, and may include presentations by community social service agencies.

   b. **incentives** - these are awards, honours, and material reinforcement (e.g., passes to special events), given to schools, classes, and individual students in recognition of school attendance.

   c. **parent-school involvement** - promoting regular school attendance is a responsibility of parents, both by consensus and by law. Many schools encourage this support by increasing two-way communication between parent and school, and by involving parents in ongoing school activities. These efforts include:

      (1) informing parents (and students) about the school attendance policy (if there is one), the associated educational philosophy and education legislation, and the procedures used to handle the problems of absenteeism.

      (2) encouraging parents to sit on school attendance committees, contribute to the establishment of attendance policies and strategies, and participate in school attendance programs and procedures.

   d. **special programs** - e.g.:

      (1) tutorial-remedial.

      (2) guidance and counselling.

      (3) work programs and vocational training - components of these programs may include:

part-time jobs for students while they finish school; work experience; career training; acquisition of work skills; job search assistance.

(4) alternative curricula and alternative programs - these include programs designed to help students stay in school (e.g., in-school suspension programs, time-out programs, school transition programs); and programs which provide former students with a remedial education, usually in conjunction with a job training program.

(5) other specialized programs - these include programs for students who are in imminent danger of dropping out, and for students who already have dropped out and who may be attracted back to some form of additional education and training, e.g.: preparation for high school equivalency certification; peer support programs (for high-risk students); special programs and class organization to ease the transition from elementary school to secondary school.

e. **specialized personnel** - these include personnel who are assigned the responsibility for maintaining attendance, detecting attendance problems, identifying causes of absenteeism, coordinating efforts to reduce truancy, and finding ways of returning dropped out students to the system. In some jurisdictions the principal or vice-principal may assume that role, while in others the responsibility is assigned to specialized personnel who may operate out of a centralized special services department or unit in the school system or who may be staff members in individual schools. In some jurisdictions these specialized personnel are

called pupil personnel workers, in others they are called attendance counsellors or truancy counsellors, and in still others it is the social workers or visiting teachers who take on the job. Required preparation for the assumption of attendance duties varies from no formal training requirement to graduate degrees. (Ontario prefers, but does not require, that attendance counsellors take a three-part Ministry of Education attendance counsellor certification course consisting of approximately 200 hours of classroom instruction.)

f. **public relations methods** - to promote awareness of, and create public support for, school enrolment and regular school attendance, and to focus attention on the school systems' special programs and other efforts to hold on to students and to provide re-entry for students who have dropped out.

g. **school-community coordination:**

(1) social service agencies - many school programs which have been developed to address student absenteeism depend upon the cooperation, support, and active participation of community social service agencies. The major participants include probation services, child welfare agencies, the police, the courts, medical facilities, and other clinical services. The degree and kind of involvement varies greatly.

(2) local businesses and industries - these have contributed personnel to school committees and task forces, facilities for public information, equipment for business and industrial training, and incentives for attendance. They also have been instrumental in initiating and/or participating in work-study programs.

2. **Follow-up of individual attendance problems**. Assessment and intervention in cases of individual attendance problems may progress through several levels, or may involve more than one level simultaneously.

   a. **classroom** - the teacher may attempt to deal with the problem through conferences with the student and parents.

   b. **school** - if the outcome at the classroom level is not satisfactory, the student may be referred to a school administrator, a school special services person, or a special school attendance team or committee.

   c. **community** - social services agencies and committees made up of both school and community representatives may be asked to help with both assessment and intervention.

   d. **judicial authorities** - the final level for assessment and resolution in many educational systems is involvement of the judicial authorities. In the juvenile justice system, the methods and procedures may include judicial hearings and reviews, removal from the home, detention, involvement of probation services, and parental fines. During our visits around North America we heard arguments both for and against the use of the courts as an intervention in truancy. The majority of the persons with whom we visited were of the opinion that the courts were not the best place to seek solutions to attendance problems, but that, in some instances, and where all other efforts had been unsuccessful, the final authority of the court is needed.

C. **Current Research in Program Evaluation**. We found very little research being done about attendance problems or about non-attenders themselves, or in the form of program evaluation, either in conjunction with or as a part of the

school and community programs with which we had contact. There is very little effort, and there are very few resources, devoted to such research, and the little that is being done often lacks in controls or in breadth. In general, North American programs are paying more attention to how to address attendance problems than whether they are addressing the problems effectively.

D. **Discussion**. There is a lot of imagination, planning, energy, and concern which has gone into the development of programs of intervention for attendance problems and drop-out.[7] There is relatively little that is going into program evaluation and other research on non-attendance. In the U.S. it appears that the major interest now lies in school drop-outs and in drop-out programs, the latter including programs to prevent students from dropping out, programs to try to keep students in school at least part time, and programs to lure current drop-outs back into some form of continuing education. Truancy and attendance remain of interest in the U.S. more because (1) truancy is considered to be a predictor of drop-out, and (2) funding is based in part on level of attendance.

Following is a discussion of selected issues.

1. **General needs of a good attendance program**. There are some issues, characteristics, and procedures of attendance programs about which there appear to be consensus (if not hard data nor complete agreement). A program needs to have:
   - an atmosphere of caring about what happens to students.
   - the involvement and motivation of teachers and school administrators, as well as of students, plus the coordinated involvement of the home, the

[7] A selection of promising programs and procedures is presented in the appendices of the complete report of Volume III.

various community components, and all levels of government.

- flexibility in the handling of students and of student problems.
- the home informed when a student is absent.
- a quick response to attendance problems.
- early identification of high-risk children.
- some local (school level) autonomy in setting up programs and approaches appropriate to the community from which the school draws its students.
- common (across school systems) definitions.
- good reporting procedures.
- adequate staffing to deal with truancy, drop-out, and program evaluation.
- program evaluation.
- the availability of the court, as a last resort, to back up attendance laws.

There also is a good measure of agreement that:

- truancy is a "symptom" or sign of something gone wrong.
- there is a complexity of contributions to attendance problems.
- there is a need for another look at what are the goals of education and what are the best educational programs to achieve these goals.

It does not appear, however, that there is one ideal program which fits all communities. The circumstances, resources, and problems of different geographical areas, different sources and amounts of funding, different laws, differences in local custom, different school district sizes, differences in prevailing socioeconomic status, different population densities, even different climates - all of these and more mean that each community must plan attendance, truancy, and drop-out programs in terms of what makes educational sense in that place.

2. **Definitions**. Terms such as "absenteeism" and "truancy" are used sometimes as synonyms and sometimes to refer to different behaviours. The criteria for "truancy" and "truant" are different in different places. "Program" is another term which does not have a standard usage. This lack of standardization in definitions produces difficulties in comparing rates of truancy and drop-out in different places, in comparing research results from studies done in different places, and in assessing the effectiveness of different systems of intervention.

3. **Early identification**. Some school systems are attempting to identify potential non-attenders and potential drop-outs as early as Kindergarten, and are involving these students in programs designed to avoid the predicted outcome. These efforts raise questions about the effects of such identification in and of itself, the effectiveness of the interventions, and the psychological and economic costs of false positives (i.e., mistakenly identifying a student as one who will have an attendance problem in the future).

4. **Attendance counsellors**. Considering the knowledge and abilities involved in gaining the confidence of absentees and their families, identifying characteristics and circumstances which keep children out of school or lead them away from school, selectinng the appropriate methods from an array of intervention procedures, and coordinating the efforts of students, families, school teachers, school administrators, community agencies, community businesses and industries, and the judicial system, the persons who are given the responsibility for dealing with absenteeism need to have considerable education, training, and experience in a number of areas. (In the Recommendations section of this report, this matter is discussed further.)

OVERVIEW OF VOLUME IV. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES: CLASSIFICATION OF MALE YOUNG OFFENDERS WITH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE PROBLEMS[8]

Jerome D. Pauker, B.A., M.S., Ph.D.

Purpose

Research results, theory, and experience suggest that (1) non-attendance (including truancy) can be subclassified into kinds or types of non-attendance, (2) children of different types may have different rates of non-attendance, and (3) there may be complex interactions between types of non-attendance and types of children.

The urgent need to deal with non-attendance, the presence of non-attendance as a problem in the histories of so many of the young persons referred by Ontario Provincial Family Courts to the province's several family court clinics, and the interest of the principal investigator in classification, led to the design of the study reported in this paper.

The main purposes of this study are (1) to classify delinquents by non-attendance complaint, (2) to determine the behaviour/personality characteristics of delinquent non-attenders, (3) to classify delinquent non-attenders by behaviour/personality type, (4) to determine the relationship of a number of behaviour/personality, family, social, and other variables to non-attendance and to non-attendance categories, and (5) to determine the relationship of non-attendance and non-attendance categories to behaviour/personality variables and types.

---

[8]The contributions to the study by the following persons are acknowledged with gratitude. Colleen Moore and Candy Pauker read through and extracted information from over 1,400 case records. Cathy Melville helped with data entry, selected and ran mainframe computer program, and did the programming for PC analyses. Ronald Langevin was consulted regarding some of the statistical analyses.

This study is directed toward determining whether the mass of truant persons is best considered as a group or as a number of groups. If the latter is found to be true, the correlates should contribute to a better understanding of non-attendance and may provide information that may aid prediction and facilitate differential management.

Method

The subjects for this study are 1,297 boys aged 12-16, almost all of them adjudicated delinquents (under the Canadian Juvenile Delinquents Act). They were referred by Ontario Provincial Family Court judges to the Family Court Clinic of the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry (Toronto) for clinical assessment. The assessments were done during the years 1972-1980.

The subjects could be assigned to one of three attendance subgroups, based on information contained in the subjects' clinical records:

1. **Truancy Charge (TC)** - the subject has a court finding of truancy.
2. **Attendance Problem (AP)** - the criteria for this assignment are that (a) there was no truancy charge, but (b) there was an indication in the clinical record that the subject was absenting himself from school.
3. **No Attendance Problem (NAP)** - these subjects neither were charged with truancy nor had any indication of an attendance problem in the clinical record.

Two research assistants read the clinical records of the 1,297 boys and extracted and coded descriptors from each record using a standard guide, the Clinical Record Behaviour Checklist (CRBC). The CRBC was developed by the principal investigator,

and has a background in the work of Quay[9], Sines et al.[10], and Pauker and Sines[11]. It has 184 items which can be scored for nine behaviour dimension scales[12], the following five of which were used in this study:

Conduct Disorder (CD) - self-centred; untrustworthy; quick-tempered; assaultive; insulting; malicious; defiant; irresponsible; lacking in conscience or guilt; blaming others for their own mistakes.

Attention Deficit-Immaturity (AI) - sluggish; short attention span; poor concentration; distractable; inaccurate; give up easily; dependent; demanding; follow lead of others; trouble learning.

Motor Expression (ME) - noisy; overtalkative; overactive; inattentive; careless; restless; clumsy.

Anxiety-Withdrawal (AW) - anxious; depressed; low self-confidence; fearful in new situations; easily hurt; shy; submissive; feel sorry for what they have done when they get into trouble.

---

[9]Quay, H. C. (1986). Chapt. 1. Classification. In H. C. Quay & J. S. Werry (Eds.). Psychopathological disorders of childhood (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

[10]Sines, J. O., Pauker, J. D., Sines, L. K., & Owen, D. R. (1969). Identification of clinically relevant dimensions of children's behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 728-734.

[11]Pauker, J. D., & Sines, J. O. (1980). The Missouri-Ontario Children's Behaviour Checklist (1980 Revision). Toronto: Authors, 1980.

[12]Previous work in the Family Court Clinic has established the interrater reliability and the validity of the CRBC. In addition, the interrater reliability of the two research assistants was determined at three points during the data collection for this study; there were no significant differences between the assistants in mean behaviour dimension scores for the clinical records which the two assistants both (independently) reviewed.

Socialized Aggression (SA) - relatively well adjusted; have a different moral code and conduct code than that of established society, and behave (including law-breaking behaviours) consistently in keeping with that viewpoint; can form close relationships, and are loyal to their friends and group.

For some of the statistical data analyses, the total group of 1,297 cases was split into two half-groups, so that the analyses could be done with one half and the findings verified in the second half; in effect it was an internal replication.

In addition to the CRBC data, additional information was available in the computer-stored data base of coded responses to the Family Court Clinic's standard intake interview.

The three attendance subgroups (Truancy Charge; Attendance Problem; No Attendance Problem) were compared on mean CRBC behaviour dimension scores and on intake interview information.[13]

Results and Discussion

Significant differences were found among the three attendance subgroups in both split-halves for two of the CRBC behaviour dimensions:

1. The Truancy Charge subgroup is significantly higher than the other two subgroups on Anxiety-Withdrawal.
2. The Attendance Problem subgroup is significantly higher than the Truancy Charge subgroup, which in turn is significantly higher than the No Attendance Problem subgroup, on the Socialized Aggression behaviour dimension.

The CRBC profiles of behaviour dimension scores for each subject could be characterized also in terms of patterns of

---

[13]Statistics used, depending on the data and distribution characteristics, were analysis of variance (with Newman-Keuls comparisons of pairs for significant F ratios), chi square (with Yates' correction for two-by-two tables), and the t test.

scores, and additional significant differences were found among the three attendance subgroups. Significant differences were found also for 15 of the 49 intake interview variables.

Over all, then, the three attendance subgroups are different from each other, as groups, in CRBC behaviour dimensions, in other demographic, social, and behavioural information, and in their histories of encounters with the police and courts. Overall, too, the behaviour dimension score patterns derived from the CRBC distinguish among the three attendance subgroups.

Pulling together all of these findings (which are presented in more detail in the complete report for Volume IV) results in the following descriptions of each of the attendance groups.

Truancy Charge (TC) - There is a significant tendency (appearing in both split half samples as well as in the total sample) for the Truancy Charge attendance subgroup to be higher than the other two attendance subgroups on the Anxiety-Withdrawal dimension. These adolescents tend to have more of the "neurotic" reactions than do the rest of the subjects; they are troubled, their self-esteem appears lowered, and they do not interact easily with others. Their school avoidance involves anxiety, partly, perhaps, as precursor or cause, and partly, perhaps, as reaction. Although the adolescents in this subgroup are more likely than the subjects in the other two attendance subgroups to be the biological children of their current parents, these parents are less likely to be living together (the father being the parent who is most likely to be out of the home), suggesting that the TC subjects may have experienced more home disruption than those in the other two attendance subgroups. The mothers of the TC subjects are less likely to be married at present. For some of these subjects, then, their avoidance of school may be a way of dealing with anxiety, their concerns may have some basis in home and family circumstances, and among these students may be some who would fit the criteria for school refusal (school

phobia). These subjects also appear to have had less of a previous record of lawbreaking.

Attendance Problem (AP) - There is a significant tendency (appearing in both split half samples as well as in the total sample) for the Attendance Problem subgroup to be higher than the other two attendance subgroups on the Socialized Aggression dimension. These adolescents, then, tend to be antisocial in relation to the broader society (though not to their in-group), and this may be seen also in the finding that they also have more of a history of lawbreaking. (The latter finding does not appear to be only a matter of more years at risk because, although the AP subjects are somewhat older on the average than those in the other two attendance subgroups, the mean age difference is less than three months.) The absenteeism of the Attendance Problem subjects may be seen, at least in part or at least for some of the subgroup subjects, as an expression of their antipathy toward or lack of concern for the aims and means of the society they reject.

No Attendance Problem - These subjects, as a subgroup, do not distinguish themselves from the other two subgroups on CRBC scores except by having the lowest mean score on Socialized Aggression; in other words, this subgroup is distinguished by what it is not rather than by what it is. The subjects in this subgroup, being more likely to have mothers who are married, being less likely to have behaviour problems at school, and having fewer grade failures than subjects in the other two subgroups, appear to have at least a few more positive circumstances in their lives than do those in the other two attendance subgroups. Nevertheless, this subgroup is very similar to the Attendance Problem subgroup in rank order of offences and in the proportion of subjects charged with each offence, so that type of offence does not appear to be a distinguishing characteristic for these two attendance subgroups.

It should be noted that, although there are these differences among the three attendance subgroups, there are many individual subjects in each subgroup who have some of the characteristics of the other subgroups.

The results support the following conclusions:

1. Adolescents with attendance problems cannot be considered to be a homogeneous group. Their diversity has to be taken into account when planning problems of intervention and when considering how to help the individual non-attender.
2. The diversity among adolescent non-attenders does not mean that classification is meaningless or useless or, as some might claim, inherently harmful. Among male adjudicated delinquents referred by the courts for clinical assessment, the very broad attendance subgroups were different from each other in meaningful ways, and finer discriminations by behavioural dimensions can provide information of use in planning for individual intervention within attendance subgroups.
3. Absenting oneself from school is a behaviour which signifies, even among the young offenders of the Family Court Clinic, the presence of other characteristics of concern. Those who have been charged with truancy are, as a group, more emotionally upset and have more family disruption than the rest of the Family Court Clinic offenders, and the large group of adolescents who absent themselves from school without having been charged with truancy are, as a group, more antisocial in attitude and have a history of more involvement with the police and courts than the other Family Court Clinic parents. This should not be taken to mean that truancy plays a causal role here, because the design of this study does not permit the determination of whether truancy promotes (or exacerbates) other difficulties or whether it is merely a benign correlate of them. It is, however, an indicator, and its presence ought not to be ignored.

PRINCIPLES

Arising out of the four parts of this project are a number of principles or conclusions, which, in turn, form the basis for the project recommendations. Other persons might derive different or additional principles. Though written as separate, discrete principles, a number of them overlap or are related to each other. Some of the principles may be seen as being very simple or obvious, but it was felt better to state the obvious rather than to risk missing it.

Perhaps the most general of principles is that it is somewhat artificial to make recommendations regarding school attendance in isolation from a consideration of the entire education enterprise given the overall complexity of attendance problems and given the large number of psychological, social, cultural, economic, familial, medical, curricular, and education organizational circumstances which have been implicated in absenteeism. As we point out below and elsewhere in the project reports, non-attendance can be seen as being a problem in itself or an adaptation to trying circumstances or a sign of something else gone wrong; non-attendance can signify problems in the child, problems in the family, problems in the school, problems in society, or problems in and among any or all elements of the system. And any of these problems may be troubling to some individual students or groups of students and not constitute a significant problem to others.

It follows, then, that the design and types of programs and methods for decreasing non-attendance will vary depending on where the major causes and influences are seen to lie and at what level in the system the interventions are established, as well as on the educational philosophy and goals of the school system.

The following principles, and the subsequent recommendations, should be considered within the context of the discussion above.

General Principles

P-1. Non-attendance may be a problem in itself, or it may be a part of a larger problem, or it may signify and arise out of another problem, or it may be all three.

P-2. Non-attendance can be the result of a simple circumstance, or it can have multiple causes.

P-3. It must be emphasized that, although the literature records a large variety of correlates of attendance problems, correlates cannot be assumed to be causes; the fact that something is found to be associated with a condition does not mean that it has been shown to be a cause of the condition.

P-4. Students with school attendance problems are not a homogeneous group. They differ considerably among themselves in how much they absent themselves, the pattern of absenting, the correlates of and contributors to absenteeism, and their responses to different kinds of intervention.

P-5. Non-attendance can be an isolated event occurring or beginning at any point in the child's school history, or it may represent a continuing and escalating behaviour which may manifest itself first in sporadic absence, later in more chronic truancy, and finally in school drop-out. The implication for intervention is that what one does to intervene will vary depending on the child's age, development, and history of absence.

P-6. There is no one cause for all non-attendance, nor is there one solution. In dealing with the attendance problems of individual students, there has to be some degree of freedom for attendance counsellors and other education personnel to select from a variety of intervention procedures, and to combine elements of different intervention programs, to meet individual student needs.

P-7. Differences in local circumstances, practices, resources, customs, mores, and attitudes, may enhance the effect of an intervention in one geographical area, make the same

intervention unfeasible or impracticable in another, and result in detrimental effects in a third.

Consistency

P-8. There is a need for consistency within school boards and districts in the enforcement of school attendance.

Early Identification

P-9. It is important to identify attendance problems as early as possible and to evaluate the situation as quickly as possible, so that any warranted intervention can be instituted quickly.

Record Keeping

P-10. Accurate, standard attendance records are essential; without them it is very difficult to operate a successful program or to do program evaluation.

P-11. School enrolment figures may not provide the same information as school attendance figures; enrolment may provide an inaccurate picture of attendance.

Follow-up

P-12. It is less likely that an attendance problem will develop if there is an immediate follow-up to individual student absences.

P-13. Some students' attendance behaviour will improve if there is an intervention at the local school level (e.g., remedial program; attendance contract), while in other cases there needs to be an intervention at the school board or district level (e.g., placement in a special education program) or at the community level (e.g., counselling by a social service agency) before attendance improves. Personnel who deal with non-attendance should have access to each level, so that the interventions at the different levels can be brought smoothly into effect as needed.

Parent Support and Involvement

P-14. Parent involvement is a necessary component of a successful overall attendance program.

P-15. Parents and the community need to be informed about the school's attendance policies which guide the school's expectations of its students (and of parents) and which are the background for the school's procedures for encouraging attendance and discouraging and dealing with non-attendance.

Community Support and Involvement

P-16. Community support and involvement in ongoing school activities is an important aspect of encouraging school attendance.

P-17. The schools and community social agencies need to develop cooperative approaches to attendance problems, because many of these problems require assessment and intervention by agencies outside the school system.

Courts

P-18. The courts have a role to play in providing a final, independent authority in (1) instances of apparently intractable and irreconcilable attendance disputes between the school on the one hand and a student and/or parent on the other, and (2) cases of truancy in which all other available approaches either have been tried to no avail or have been considered, but not tried for good reason.

P-19. Experience suggests that, for some children, the court (or judge) will have a salutary effect on attendance when nothing else seems to work. This suggests also that it may be possible to identify kinds of children, or of child-situation combinations, for whom the first, most beneficial, most appropriate intervention is a charge and court appearance. (This suggests, in addition, that there may be some children who never should come before a judge because a court appearance may have no or even harmful

effects.) This is a problem area which might be clarified by research if the attendant ethical and civil rights issues can be resolved.

Education Programs

P-20. Education should be presented in such a way that it is perceived by students as a positive and useful undertaking, so that remaining in school becomes a real and compelling option in students' minds.

P-21. There is more than one route to a high school diploma. At times and in places, however, there seems to be a certain rigidity, or a lack of resources, that leads to an insistence on basic knowledge being imparted only in one way or within a very limited number of diploma route alternatives. Such a limitation, in failing to allow for accommodation to the variety of learning styles, preferences, and motivations among students, may increase the likelihood of failure or of perceived lack of accomplishment, and thereby may contribute to absenteeism and to drop-out.

P-22. To encourage school attendance, it is important that the education system provide in curricula, in attitude, and in example, the recognition of the variety of satisfactory and attainable life goals, as well as the variety of educational paths to reach these goals.

P-23. School programs which meet the individual educational needs of students are important in maintaining and encouraging attendance. These programs include alternative curricula and alternative schools, special education, work experience, vocational training, guidance and counselling, and tutorial and remedial programs.

P-24. It is important that the education system provide for (1) the students who are older than the compulsory age limit, and (2) students who have dropped out of school and who may wish to return either full time or to some limited extent.

Alternatives to Out-of-School Suspension

P-25. Students who are suspended are potential drop-outs, as the suspension can help to lead the student away from the school system and from further education. Alternatives to out-of-school suspension may have more holding power for many students with attendance problems. Some creative thinking may result in a more educational use of suspension (such as the in-school suspension programs which are in use in some areas of North America), as well as alternatives to suspension itself.

Funding

P-26. The complexity of the presumed causes of a contributor to attendance problems, and the variety of possible programs which might positively affect attendance patterns, put a strain on all educational resources, including funding. Supplementary funding may be available outside the traditional government sources. (In the United States, business and industry have contributed money and equipment, as well as personnel and expertise, to supplement the education funds provided by the individual states, and these, along with U.S. federal funds, have enabled the establishment of a wider variety of intervention programs than some of the individual states could provide by themselves. In Canada, of course, the history and tradition of federal-provincial relationships are much different than they are in the United States.)

Classification

P-27. Because different problems may arise out of different circumstances, because different needs may require different interventions, and because different kinds of people react differently to different intervention procedures, classification (of students, of families, of home and school environments) may be of help in the differential management of school attendance problems.

Program Evaluation/Research

P-28. Evaluation is an essential part of every effort to prevent and intervene in school attendance problems. This applies to methods and procedures, as well as to programs. Evaluation enables (1) the identification of effective programs, (2) the determination of problems and situations for which particular programs may be especially effective, (3) the identification of the critical elements in successful programs, (4) the determination of why a promising program failed and what can be learned and salvaged from the failure. Hunches, intuition, logic, theory, and unsystematic and uncontrolled comparisons, all can provide valuable guides to promising approaches and to ideas about what appears to make an intervention work, but planned, controlled investigations are more likely to provide more sound answers to questions regarding the effectiveness and key components of procedures to increase attendance and deal with attendance problems.

Attendance Personnel Roles

P-29. Personnel specialized for work with attendance problems should be identified, and their roles for evaluation and resolving attendance problems should be defined.

Staff Training and Development

P-30. The variety and complexity of attendance problems require that attendance counsellors function at a professional level in terms of the knowledge required and the management, interpersonal, and therapeutic skills employed. It follows that attendance counsellors must have the advanced education and training that will fit them for their demanding jobs.

P-31. All those in the education system who are responsible for encouraging, monitoring, and enforcing attendance, and who have some function in dealing with non-attendance problems, need to have special additional knowledge about

the theories, research, and other information regarding attendance and non-attendance.

P-32. Teaching personnel, special services personnel, and attendance counsellors need to work cooperatively and with mutual respect if there is to be consistency and effectiveness in the system's response to the attendance problems of individual students. This requires that all personnel be aware of the roles, functions, and capabilities of each other in regard to both the total education enterprise and the promotion and maintenance of school attendance, and they should be encouraged to interact more with each other.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations derive from the foregoing principles and from the several parts of the project. The numbering and headings of the recommendations are not meant to parallel or otherwise relate to the numbering of the principles or of the project parts; any one recommendation may have a background in two or more principles and parts.

Legislation

R-1. Any remedies and sanctions for non-attendance which may be written into education legislation or provided in associated regulations or administrative codes must be consonant with other legislation, both provincial/state and federal, civil and criminal, so that dispositions are determined by the same criteria in the best interests of the child.

R-2. Attendance provisions in education law must be considered in relationship to each other and to other aspects of the education legislation, so that the coherence and major thrust of the legislation is maintained.

R-3. Mandated programs for dealing with non-attendance should have allowance for some measure of local autonomy and flexibility, as well as for more central control and accountability.

(See also **R-32** and **R-33.**)

Consistency

R-4. Each school board and district should have its own procedures and consequences for attendance and non-attendance set out in a printed manual, to maintain consistency of enforcement of school attendance.

R-5. Consideration should be given to the relative usefulness of terms such as "truant", "truancy", and "excused absence", in order to establish definitions which allow both for local standards and for province-wide (and legally acceptable) application.

Identification

R-6. School boards and districts need to develop clear criteria for quick identification of attendance problems, and clear guidelines for follow-up.

R-7. Methods and procedures for early identification of attendance problems should extend down into the elementary school level.

Record Keeping

R-8. Whatever the specific form that record keeping may take, it should be accurate and standardized across the province. This would be facilitated by a province-wide computerized system.
(See also **R-12.**)

R-9. Local school boards and districts should calculate both actual attendance and enrolment statistics, to provide the Ministry of Education with a more accurate picture of school attendance.
(See also **R-48.**)

Reporting and Monitoring

R-10. There should be standard times during the school year when each school reports its attendance figures to its school board or district.

R-11. Methods and procedures should be set up, at all education system levels, to make use of attendance records as a means of flagging individual students, schools, and boards or districts, as potential attendance problems.

R-12. At the provincial level, the monitoring of individual student movement would be facilitated by the assignment to each student of a unique number or code. This would permit more accurate tracking or academic progress and geographical movement of each student through his/her elementary and secondary school career.

R-13. Guidelines should be established for demonstrating and reporting on progress in home instruction.

Follow-up

R-14. School boards and districts need to develop clear guidelines for follow-up.

R-15. Initial attempts to deal with absenteeism should occur at the local school level. However, if the problem becomes more chronic or severe, it is important that the case be referred to more specialized personnel.

R-16. Immediate attention should be paid in response to each absence (e.g., via phone call to parents, letter, home visit).

(See also **R-48.**)

Focus in the School

R-17. School personnel who have the responsibility for case management must retain this responsibility throughout the entire course of follow-up.

Parent Involvement

R-18. Parents should be involved with the school in a number of ways, which, for example, might include: soliciting their input into the development of the school's policy on attendance and non-attendance; participation in committees attempting to deal with non-attendance which is related to local community conditions; involvement in attendance programs offering consultation, advice, and support to families of children who have attendance problems.

Community Involvement

R-19. There should be ongoing discussions among the school systems and social agencies at both local and more senior levels, for the purpose of developing and implementing cooperative approaches to attendance problems.

R-20. The interest of community organizations (including business, industry, and service groups) in school attendance should be solicited and encouraged. Examples of such community involvement are: membership on school

committees; distribution of newsletters; displays in local centres; Adopt-a-School programs.

R-21. Additional public and private funding, personnel, and equipment resources, for operating alternative programs, should be explored to determine their desirability and feasibility.

Courts

R-22. The courts should remain a resource to the school, to children, and to parents (when all other interventions have been attempted, or considered and dismissed with good reason).

Coordination of Services

R-23. Given the continuum of non-attendance, including school truancy and school drop-out, those involved with any non-attendance issues should work within an organizational framework which permits close coordination of these efforts.

R-24. School systems should coordinate the efforts of personnel across the schools, external agencies, and levels of government; this will help to provide consistency in the development, application, and evaluation of attendance programs.

Program Issues

R-25. Any recommended or otherwise desirable program should not be designed for rigid and inflexible application, but should be considered as a model which can be adapted to meet the needs and the characteristics of the local community and student body.

Work-Study Programs

R-26. Work release programs (such as Ontario's Supervised Alternative Learning Experience: SALEP) should be monitored closely so that both the schools and the

ministry can be assured that the student involved in the programs actually is actually employed and in school.

R-27. Work-Study programs should require specified school attendance and educational performance as conditions of employment.

R-28. Consideration should be given to the involvement of students at the intermediate grade levels in some form of work experience programs. Such experiences would include both paid and volunteer work.

Education Programs as Intervention

R-29. School boards and districts should establish a variety of educational programs which may serve as interventions for students with attendance problems. Such programs might include: in-school suspension; adolescent parenting courses; day care for children of adolescent parents; work experience; career counselling; education remediation; educational approaches which allow for more individual educational planning (such as alternative schools and other alternative educational arrangements).

Incentives for Attendance

R-30. Incentives or rewards for attendance, as well as consequences for non-attendance, should be provided.

Alternatives to Out-of-School Suspension

R-31. Alternatives to out-of-school suspension should be made available as part of a planned program for increasing attendance and avoiding drop-out.

Attendance in Private Schools

R-32. Students in private schools should be subject to the attendance requirements of the Education Act.

Staff Training and Development

R-33. Minimal qualifications, including training for attendance counsellors, should be included in the education regulations.

R-34. The current Ontario training program for attendance counsellors should be reviewed and expanded to be more in keeping with the professional level of their duties and functions.

R-35. All education personnel should have pre-service and in-service training aimed at increasing their knowledge about attendance and non-attendance issues and about the roles and functions of attendance counsellors. These personnel would include teachers, teaching assistants, vice-principals, principals, supervisory officers, and student services personnel.

Program Evaluation/Research

R-36. The evaluation of interventions should be required and built into each evaluation procedure, project, or program. Efforts at both the individual and system-wide levels should be assessed.

R-37. Studies need to be replicated. This is true particularly of small sample studies. Replications are needed on samples similar to those in the original study and on samples from other populations, the latter to test the limits to which findings can be generalized.

R-38. Research reports need to provide clear descriptions of the defining characteristics of their non-attending subjects.

R-39. Studies in which complex interventions are used need to have controls for each intervention element, or need to be supplemented by studies in which the individual elements are explored adequately, if the contribution of each element is to be determined.

R-40. Longer follow-up periods are needed to determine the power of interventions to maintain attendance over longer periods of time and to assess the effects (on achievement,

on employment, and on student satisfaction) of increasing school attendance.

R-41. Longitudinal studies could help to clear the waters which sometimes are muddied by cross-sectional approaches.

R-42. There needs to be closer look at possible areas of difference between boys and girls in causes, predictors, and correlates of non-attendance, and in intervention outcomes.

R-43. There is a need for studies which address the question of whether keeping drop-outs in school actually does or does not lead to more or better employment, less social discord, more personal satisfaction, increased achievement, etc. Although there is evidence that students who drop out of school do not, as a group, fare as well economically and in other socially significant ways as do those who graduate from high school, there is no evidence that this is a causal link; there is no evidence which bears on the question of whether dropping out has the effect on employability, independent of previous amount of education, and there is no evidence which bears on the question of whether those students who dropped out of school would or would not have added to their education, and, therefore, their employability, had they remained in some kind of educational program.

R-44. Volume IV of this project, the study of the relationships between the attendance behaviour and the behaviour dimensions of boys in a Family Court Clinic, should be replicated with a sample of girls from the same clinic, to determine the same relationships for the girls and to compare these relationships with those of the boys.

R-45. The study reported in Volume IV of this project should be done in some of its aspects with a sample of adolescent boys and girls from the general population of Metropolitan Toronto secondary school students, to see if the findings generalize to the general secondary school population.

R-46. A valuable and unique predictive study could be mounted, taking advantage of the demographic, familial, social, clinical, and behaviour dimensional data already collected for the 1,300 boys of the Volume IV study. Those subjects, who were evaluated in the Family Court Clinic some 7 to 15 years ago, could be located and interviewed to determine what had happened to them since then in terms of education, employment, and other socially significant circumstances and events. The results of such a study not only would provide information of a predictive nature (e.g., what do school attendance and non-attendance predict both by themselves and in combination with other variables), but also would hold significance for intervention selection, planning, and programming (e.g., what subsequent educational and other events in high risk subjects were associated with a more favourable outcome, and what subsequent circumstances in low risk subjects led to a less favourable outcome). Such a study also could be done for girls seen earlier in the Family Court Clinic.

Other Recommendations

R-47. Attention needs to be paid to what appear to be critical periods (for the appearance of attendance problems) in the progression through the school grades, and in physiological and psychosocial development. These critical periods include: primary school for boys; the transition from primary or junior schools to middle or junior high schools and from the intermediate level schools to senior high schools; puberty and the onset of adolescence.

R-48. For Ontario, the reasons for the reportedly higher drop-out rate in the General level of education (as compared to the Advanced and Basic Levels) should be investigated. It should be noted that absence and drop-out data are collected by the Ministry of Education across levels and not within levels, and that our information about the differences among levels is the

impression of some ministry personnel rather than based on collected hard data. It would be worthwhile, then, for the ministry to establish standard criteria for the identification of the level a student is in, which would enable evaluation of information by level of secondary education.

APPENDIX A. RECOMMENDED READING

The following are papers and books which are recommended to those Ministry/Department of Education officials, school board/district personnel, school administrative, teaching, and special services staff, who have responsibility for maintaining and promoting attendance and for dealing with absentees and drop-outs.

Berg, I., Goodwin, A., Hullin, R., & McGuire, R. E. (1983). A reply to Dr. J. D. Pratt. British Journal of Criminology, 23, 353-357.

Birman, B. F., & Natriello, G. (1978). Perspectives on absenteeism in high schools. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 11(4), 29-38.

Brown, D. (1983). Truants, families, and schools: A critique of the literature on truancy. Educational review, 35, 225-235.

Chmela, J., Chmela, W., & Ely, D. F. (1985). Student absenteeism, truancy, school dropout. Gardena, California: Law Distributors. (Published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.)

Collins, D. V. (1977). Compulsory education: An historical and philosophical analysis. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 7605-7606A.

Doss, D. A., & Holley, F. M. (1985). A study of dropouts in the Austin Independent School District. Spectrum, 3, Winter, 23-31.

Ekstrom, R. B., Goertz, J. M., Pollack, J. M., & Rock, D. A. (1986). Who drops out of high school and why? Findings from a national study. Teachers College Record, 87, 356-373.

ERS Report. (1977). Student absenteeism. Educational Research Service, Inc.

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. Teachers College Record, 87, 393-409.

Galloway, D. (1985). Raising standards and reducing dropout rates. Teachers College Record, 87, 410-429.

Hammack, F. M. (1986). Large school systems' dropout reports: An analysis of definitions, procedures, and findings. Teachers College Record, 87, 324-341.

Howe, H. (1985). Giving equity a chance in the excellence game. In B. Gross, & R. Gross (Eds.). The great school debate. New York: Simon and Schuster, 281-297.

Karweith, N. (1976). A reanalysis of the effect of quantity of schooling on achievement. Sociology of Education, 49, 236-246.

Kirsh, S. (1984). Chapter 10. Adolescent problems: Dynamics and practice. In F. Maidman (Ed.). Child Welfare. New York: Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 289-321.

Mann, D. (1986). Can we help dropouts: Thinking about the undoable. Teachers College Record, 87, 307-323.

Morrow, G. (1986). Standardizing practice in the analysis of school dropouts. Teachers College Record, 87, 342-355.

Natriello, G. (1984). Problems in the evaluation of students and student disengagement from secondary schools. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17, 14-24.

Natriello, G., Pallas, A. M., & McDill, E. L. (1986). Taking stock: Renewing our research agenda on the causes and consequences of dropping out. Teachers College Record, 87, 430-440.

Polivkas, L., et al. (1979). Removal of status offenders from the juvenile justice system: The Florida experience. Child Welfare, 58, 177-186.

Pratt, J. D. (1983). Folk-lore and fact in truancy research. British Journal of Criminology, 23, 336-353.

Robins, L. N., & Ratcliff, K. S. (1980). The long-term outcome of truancy. In L. Hersov & I. Berg (Eds.). Out of school. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 65-83.

Robins, L. N., Ratcliff, K. S., & West, P. A. (1979). School achievement in two generations: A study of 88 urban black families. In S. J. Shamsie (Ed.). New directions in children's mental health. New York: Spectrum Publications, 105-129.

Robins, L. N., & Wish, E. (1977). Development of childhood deviance: Study of 223 urban black men from birth to 18. In M. F. McMillan & Sergia Henao (Eds.). Child psychiatry. Treatment and research. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers, 226-256.

Rutter, M. (1985). Family and school influences on behavioural development. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 26, 349-368.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Safer, D. J. (1982). Dimensions and issues of school programs for disruptive youth. In D. J. Safer (Ed.). School programs for disruptive adolescents. Baltimore: University Park Press, 67-90.

Safer, D. J., & Heaton, R. C. (1982). Characteristics, school patterns, and behavioural outcomes of seriously disruptive junior high school students. In D. J. Safer (Ed.). School programs for disruptive adolescents. Baltimore: University Park Press, 67-90.

Sommer, B. (1985). Truancy in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 5, 145-160.

Stipek, D. J. (1981). Adolescents - Too young to earn, too old to learn? Compulsory school attendance and intellectual development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 113-139.

Wehlage, G. G., & Rutter, R. A. (1986). Dropping out: how much do schools contribute to the problem? Teachers College Record, 87, 374-392.

Wilson, J., & Tomlinson, M. (1986). Children and education. In Wilson, J., & Tomlinson, M. Wilson: Children and the law. (2nd ed.). Toronto: Butterworths.

APPENDIX B.

COMPONENTS OF COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE STATUTES

1. Ages of compulsory education.

2. Ages public school must serve.

3. Statutory exceptions:

    a) completion of grade.
    b) home instruction.
    c) private schooling.
    d) work release.
    e) incapacity.
    f) excusal by local authority.
    g) other.

4. Appointments and duties of attendance officers.

5. Enforcement against parent:

    a) notice.
    b) sanctions.
    c) court having jurisdiction.

6. Enforcement against pupil:

    a) by school.
    b) by court.
    c) arrest and detention when truant.
    d) court having jurisdiction.

7. Statutory alternatives to court action.

8. Statutory definitions.

In this survey of the legislation, the term "parent" is used exclusively, even though the statutes may refer to "parent" or "person having the care and custody of the child" or "guardian", etc. The use of the single term is for convenience only, and has no other significance.

The ages given in the tables which summarize the legislation are inclusive, and pertain to requirements for full-time attendance.

Category "3", statutory exceptions, is divided into seven sections. The final section, "g", is intended to contain all other not previously listed mandatory exceptions, as contrasted to the previously listed category, "f", which is excusal by local authority. The distinctions, however, between "f" and "g", at least those gathered from a reading of the statutes, often are blurred. Nevertheless, because the scope of the discretion allowed local authorities is of interest, we decided to maintain these two subcategories as separate sections.

Section "5(a)", refers to any statutory notice period regarding an offence for which the parent may be held liable. For example, a notice informing the parent of child's absence, and requiring the child's attendance within a specified time, is included in this section.

Section "6(c)", arrest and detention, is intended to provide information regarding the arrest powers of school attendance officers or other personnel, and does not survey the general rules governing arrests of juveniles by peace officers.

Category "7", statutory alternatives to court action, includes those sections which are part of the compulsory attendance laws themselves, as well as those provisions of other statutes, which, for example, might include legislation dealing with drop-out prevention, or formal or informal diversion programs.

Category "8" collects statutory definitions, including those from non-education statutes, which are relevant to the previously summarized material.

APPENDIX C.

PROVINCES/TERRITORIES/STATES WHICH REPLIED TO THE SECOND INQUIRY RE ATTENDANCE STATUTES[14]

Canada

Alberta
British Columbia
Manitoba
New Brunswick
Newfoundland
Nova Scotia
Ontario
Prince Edward Island
Quebec
Saskatchewan

United States

Alaska
Arizona
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Florida
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Kansas
Kentucky
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Rhode Island
South Carolina
Tennessee
Utah
Vermont
Washington
West Virginia
Wyoming
Washington, D.C.

---

[14]The purpose of this list is meant to indicate for the reader which information in the text and in the summary tables in Appendix E and Appendix F is based on replies received directly from the sources, and which, therefore, can be assumed reasonably to be accurate and current as of summer 1986. Additional provinces/territories/states responded to our first inquiry, and we are grateful to all those who responded to either inquiry for taking the time to send us replies and materials.

APPENDIX D.

SUMMARY OF ONTARIO COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE STATUTES

ONTARIO
Revised Statutes of Ontario 1980, as amended to 1986

Education Act, c. 66

Also cited: Ontario Regulations
Provincial Offences Act, c. 400
Child and Family Services Act, S.O. 1984, c. 55
Juvenile Delinquents Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. J-3

1. Ages of Compulsory Education

s. 20(1)(a)	every child 6 years of age by 1 September of the school year shall attend an elementary or secondary school until age 16.
s. 20(1)(b)	every child who is 6 years of age after 1 September of the school year shall attend school beginning the next year until the end of June in the year the child is 16.
s. 20(4)	every child under 6 years who is enrolled shall attend school.
s. (1)(1)(49)	"elementary school" includes separate schools.

2. Ages Public School Must Serve

s. 32	6 years until the end of the school year in which the student is 21.
s. 33(1)	where there is a Kindergarten, age 5.
s. 33(2)	where there is a Junior Kindergarten, age 4.

3. Exceptions

a. s. 20(2)(d)	graduation from secondary school or the equivalent.
b., c. s. 20(2)(a)	"satisfactory" instruction at home or elsewhere.
d. s. 10(7)	Minister shall make regulations excusing children over 14 years of age from compulsory attendance.

O. Reg. 532/83	parent of child over 14 may apply to designated committee of the school board requesting part-time classes or participation in a program approved by the board involving continuing studies.
e. No; under s. 20(3), a handicap is not "of itself an unavoidable cause of absence".	
f. s. 20(2)(b)	illness or "other unavoidable cause".
s. 23(3), O.Reg. 617/81	principal may temporarily excuse pupil at any time at the request of parent.
g. s. 20(2)(c)	child living more than a specified distance from school.
(e)	absence of no more than one-half day/week for music instruction.
(f)	child under suspension, expulsion, or exclusion.
(g)	absence for religious observance.

4. Appointments and Duties of Attendance Officers

s. 23	Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint Provincial School Attendance Counsellor to "superintend and direct enforcement".
s. 24	every school board shall appoint one or more attendance counsellors to be responsible for enforcement.
s. 25(3)	school attendance counsellor is responsible to "appropriate supervisory officer" and shall carry out the directions of the Provincial Attendance Counsellor.
s. 25(4)	attendance counsellors shall inquire into absences and give warnings and notices to parents.
s. 27	prosecutions shall be initiated by attendance counsellors; where there is no attendance counsellor, the "appropriate supervisory officer" shall notify parents of the law.

5. Enforcement Against Parent

a. s. 25(4) — parents shall be given a warning of the legal consequences of child's failure to attend school.

b. s. 29(1) — parent who refuses or neglects to cause child to attend school as required is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of no more than $100.00 or to post bond of $200.00, or both, to insure child's attendance.

c. s. 30(1) — Provincial Court (Family Division) or Unified Family Court.

6. Enforcement Against Pupil

a. s. 23(1)(d), O. Reg. 617/81 — pupil is required to attend regularly.

s. 22(1)(a) — principal may suspend pupil because of "persistent truancy".

b. s. 29(5), s. 20, J.D.A. — child who refuses to attend, or who is "habitually absent" is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to the penalties provided under the Juvenile Delinquents Act, R.S.C. 1980, c. J-3 [repealed]; penalties include a maximum fine of $25.00.

Part V-A, P.O.A. — governs procedures and penalties involving children (with regard to children aged 12 to 16). Unless the maximum specified for the offence is less, maximum penalties of $1000.00 for proceedings commenced by information and $300.00 for proceedings commenced by certificate are provided. Identity of the child is protected. Probation orders are limited to one year. Imprisonment only for violation of court order.

Neither truancy nor failure to provide education are included in the definition of a child in need of protection under the C.F.S.A.

c. s. 25(1) — on written request of parent or principal, where attendance counsellor

	has reasonable and probable grounds to believe child is absent without excuse, child may be returned to parent or school, except that attendance counsellor cannot enter private dwelling without occupant's permission.
d. s. 30(1)	Provincial Court (Family Division) or Unified Family Court.

7. Statutory Alternatives to Court Action

s. 23(2)	attendance counsellor can direct inquiry into child's absence where parent considers that child was legally excused from attendance.
s. 10(7), O. Reg. 532/83	supervised alternative learning for excused pupils aged 14 to 16, at request of parents and with approval of committee of local board; may include employment, life-skills course, part-time attendance.

APPENDIX E. SUMMARY OF CANADIAN COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE STATUTES

Part A of Table

PROVINCE/ TERRITORY	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
ALBERTA	6-15, or to 18 if enrolled	6-17	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	-	$100 for 1st offence; $250 for 2nd offence; $500 or 60 days for subsequent offence; or $1,000 bond.	Provincial Court
BRITISH COLUMBIA	7-14	5 by 31 Dec. - 18	-	yes	yes	yes; 15	-	yes	yes	-	-	$10 for each day's absence	Provincial Court
MANITOBA	7-15, or over 16 if enrolled	6-20	-	yes	yes	no	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	$500 or $500 bond	Provincial Court
NEW BRUNSWICK	7-14	6-19	12	yes	yes	-	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	$20 +/or 1 day/each $10 in fines for 1st offence; $40 +/or 1 day/each $10 in fines for subsequent offence	Provincial Court
NEWFOUNDLAND	6-14	6 by 31 Dec. no upper limit specified	-	yes	no	-	-	yes	yes	-	-	$200 +/or 30 days or $200 bond for failure to attend; $25/each day of default for failure to enroll	Provincial Court
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	6-15	-	-	yes	yes	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	$100	Justice of the Peace
NOVA SCOTIA	6-15	5 by 1 Oct. - 20	-	yes	yes	yes; 12	yes	-	yes	yes	yes; 5 days	$10 for 1st offence; $20 for 2nd offence. $30 for subsequent offence, or 30 days	Family Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

PROVINCE/ TERRITORY	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
ONTARIO	6-15	6-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	$100 +/or bond of $200	Provincial Court (Family Division) or Unified Family Court
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	7-15	6-20	12	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	-	-	$50 or 30 days	Justice of the Peace
QUEBEC	6 - to end school year in which child is 15	6 - to end of school year in which child is 16	-	yes	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	-	yes	$20 or $100 bond	Youth Court
SASKATCHEWAN	7-15	6-21	-	yes	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	-	$100 or bond of $200	Provincial Court
YUKON TERRITORY	7 - until end of school year in which child is 15	-	-	yes	yes	-	-	yes	yes	yes	-	$25 or bond, and order to ensure child's attendance; $250 +/or 1 month/each day's absence for violation of order	Justice of the Peace

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table

PROVINCE/ TERRITORY	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
ALBERTA	-	-	apprehend and return to home or school	N/A	-
BRITISH COLUMBIA	-	-	-	N/A	-
MANITOBA	-	-	arrest and return to home or school	N/A	-
NEW BRUNSWICK	-	finding of child whose security or development is in danger; or child may be charged with violation of attendance laws	arrest without warrant and return to school	Provincial Court	-
NEWFOUNDLAND	report to superintendent or supervisor of school attendance	finding of child in need of supervision	-	Family or Juvenile Court	-
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	report to local authority and attendance counsellor; formal inquiry	-	school counsellor may accompany child to school	N/A	yes
NOVA SCOTIA	referral to Family Court	assessment; order to attend; finding of child in need of protection	powers of police officer	Family Court	-
ONTARIO	suspension	penalties as provided under the former Juvenile Delinquents Act, limited to fines or probation by the Provincial Offences Act.	on written request of parent or principal, attendance counsellor may detain and return child to home or school	Provincial Court (Family Division) or Unified Family Court	yes
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	report to superintendent	finding of child in need of protection	-	Supreme Court	-

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

PROVINCE/ TERRITORY	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
QUEBEC	-	finding of danger to child's security or development	-	Youth Court	yes
SASKATCHEWAN	suspension	-	arrest and return to school	N/A	yes
YUKON TERRITORY	reprimand; detention; corporal punishment; suspension	finding of child in need of guidance; diversion program	-	Youth Court	yes

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

APPENDIX F. SUMMARY OF UNITED STATES COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE STATUTES

Part A of Table

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
ALABAMA	7-15	5-20	12	nc	yes; church schools	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 3 days	$100 +/or 90 days	Juvenile Court
ALASKA	7-15	6-19	12	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	$50-$200 or 1 day/each $2 in fines for each 5 days absence	District Court
ARIZONA	8-15	5-20	10	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	-	yes	-	$500 +/or 30 days	Justice Court
ARKANSAS	7-16	5-20	12	yes	no	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes; 5 days	$10 for each day's absence	County Court
CALIFORNIA	6-15	4 through high school	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$100 for 1st offence; $250 for subsequent offence	Municipal Court
COLORADO	7-15	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 10 days	order to attend; $25 or imprisonment for contempt	Juvenile Court
CONNECTICUT	7-15	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	-	yes	-	yes	yes	$5 for each week's absence	Superior Court
DELAWARE	5-15	5-20	-	yes	yes	yes; 12	yes	yes	-	yes	yes; 3 days	$5 or 2 days for 1st offence; $25-50 or 5 days for subsequent offences; prosecution for endangering child's welfare	Magistrate Court; Family Court
FLORIDA	6-16	13 consecutive years of schooling	-	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 3 days	$500 +/or 60 days	County Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
GEORGIA	7-15	6-17	12	yes	yes	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	$100 +/or 30 days	State Court of County
HAWAII	6-17	6-16	12	yes	no	yes; 15	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	$500 +/or 30 days	Family Court
IDAHO	7-15	5-20	-	yes	no	-	yes	yes	-	no	-	petition into Probate Court; prosecution for neglect	Probate Court
ILLINOIS	7-15, or outside those ages, if enrolled	6-20	-	-	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$500 +/or 30 days	Circuit Court
INDIANA	7-15, or under 7, if enrolled	education through high school	-	-	-	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$1000 +/or 180 days	Circuit Court
IOWA	7-15	-	8	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	$100 +/or 30 days	Magistrate or District Court
KANSAS	7-15, or under 7, if enrolled	5 - no upper limit	-	-	no	-	yes	yes	yes	no	yes; 5 days	$2,500 +/or 1 year	District Court
KENTUCKY	6-15 16-17 may withdraw with parents' consent	5-20	12	-	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$10 for first offence; $20 for subsequent offence	District Court
LOUISIANA	7-15, or under 7, if enrolled	special education students from 3-21	-	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 3 days	$15 for each day's absence	Juvenile Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
MAINE	7-16	5-19	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	-	yes	yes	yes	yes; 5 days	$200	District Court
MARYLAND	6-15	5-20	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	$50 +/or 10 days	District or Juvenile Court
MASSACHUSETTS	6 - max. at local discretion	-	-	yes	no	yes; 14	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$20	Juvenile Court
MICHIGAN	6-15	5 - through high school	-	-	yes	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$5-50 +/or 2-90 days	Circuit Court
MINNESOTA	7- or younger if enrolled - 15	5-20	10	-	no	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$50 or 30 days	County Criminal Court
MISSISSIPPI	6-13	6-20	-	no	no	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$1000 +/or 1 year	Youth Court
MISSOURI	7-15	6-19	-	no	no	yes; 14	yes	-	yes	yes	yes; 3 days	15 days	Circuit Court
MONTANA	7-16	6-18	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$5-20 or 10-30 days or $100 bond	Justices' Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
NEBRASKA	7-15	5-20	12	-	no	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 week	$500 +/or 3 months	Juvenile Court
NEVADA	7-16, or under 7, if enrolled	6 - no upper limit	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$1000 +/or 6 months	Justices' Court
NEW HAMPSHIRE	6-15	6-20	8 if no local high school available	-	no	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$500 or $25 bond	District or Municipal Court
NEW JERSEY	6-15	5-19	-	no	no	yes; 14	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	$25 for 1st offence; $100 for subsequent offence	Municipal Court
NEW MEXICO	5-17	5-17; through age 20 if special education student	12	no	no	yes; 16	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	$25-$100 or community service for 1st offence; $500 +/or 6 mos. for subsequent offence	Magistrate or Metropolitan Court
NEW YORK	6-15	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 16	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$10 or 10 days for 1st offence; $50 +/or 30 days for subsequent offence	Magistrate or Family Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
NORTH CAROLINA	7-15	5 - completion of high school	-	-	no	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	$50 +/or 30 days	District Court
NORTH DAKOTA	7-15	6-20	12	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	yes	-	$500 for first offence; $500 +/or 30 days for subsequent offence	Municipal or County Court
OHIO	6-17	5-20	12	-	no	yes; 14	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$5-20 or 30 days or $100 bond	Juvenile Court
OKLAHOMA	7-17	5-21	12	-	no	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 5 days	$5-25 for 1st offence; $10-50 for second offence; at least $100 for subsequent offence for each day's absence after warning	District Court
OREGON	7-17	6-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 16	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$100 +/or 30 days	Justices' Court
PENNSYLVANIA	8-16	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 14	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes; 3 days	$2 for 1st offence; $5 for subsequent offence, or 5 days	District Justice
RHODE ISLAND	8-15	5 by 31 Dec. upper age limit	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	-	yes	-	$50 for each day's absence; if absent more than 30 days, $500 +/or 6 months; or injunction	Family Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
SOUTH CAROLINA	5-16	6-20	12	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	$50 or 10 days for each day's absence	Magistrates' Court
SOUTH DAKOTA	6-15	5-20	8	no	no	-	-	yes	-	yes	yes	$100 +/or 30 days for 1st offence; $1000 +/or 1 year for subsequent offence	Circuit Court
TENNESSEE	7-15	6 through high school	12	no	no	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes; 3 days	$2-10 for each day's absence	Juvenile Court or Court of General Sessions or City Recorder
TEXAS	7 or younger if enrolled, to end of school year in which child is 16	5-20	12	-	yes	yes; 15	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$5-25 for 1st offence; $10-20 for 2nd offence; $25-100 for each subsequent offence for each day's absence after notice	City, Justice or Juvenile Courts
UTAH	6-17	5 through high school	12	yes	no	yes; 16	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$1,000 +/or 6 months	Circuit Court
VERMONT	7-15, or over 16, if enrolled	5 through high school	10	yes	no	yes; 15	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$1000	District Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part A of Table (cont'd)

STATE	1	2	3							4	5		
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g		a	b	c
VIRGINIA	5-16	5-19	-	no	no	-	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	$100	Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
WASHINGTON	8-17	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes; 15	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$25 for each day's absence	Justice or Superior or Juvenile Court
WEST VIRGINIA	6-15	5-20	12	yes	yes	yes; grade 8	yes	yes	-	yes	yes; 10 days	$5-50 or 5-20 days for each day's absence	Magistrate Court
WISCONSIN	6-17 until end of term in which child is 18	5-19	12	yes	no	-	-	yes	yes	yes	yes; 1 day	$5-50 +/or 3 months	Circuit Court
WYOMING	7-15	6-20	8	no	no	-	yes	yes	-	yes	yes	$5-25 +/or 10 days	Justice of the Peace or District Court
WASHINGTON, D.C.	7-15	-	-	no	no	yes; 14	yes	yes	-	yes	-	$10 +/or 5 days for each 2 days absence	Family Division of Superior Court

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
ALABAMA	file complaint of habitual truancy in Juvenile Court	finding of delinquency or neglect	arrest without warrant; delivery of child to home of school	Juvenile Court	-
ALASKA	-	-	-	N/A	-
ARIZONA	failure, suspension, expulsion	finding of incorrigibility	arrest without warrant; child must be brought before authorities	Juvenile Court	-
ARKANSAS	alternative classes, suspension, denial of promotion or graduation	finding of juvenile in need supervision	-	Juvenile Court	yes
CALIFORNIA	attendance at alternate classes, suspension, course failure, referral to SARB or district attorney	order for court wardship during school hours	arrest during school hours, delivery to home, school or community centre	Juvenile Court	yes
COLORADO	academic penalty for classes missed	order to attend; contempt; finding of delinquency, dependency or neglect	-	Juvenile Court	-
CONNECTICUT	-	finding of family with service needs; $20 fine for violation of local truancy ordinance	arrest; return to school	Superior Court for Juvenile matters	-
DELAWARE	expulsion if over 16	finding of neglect	arrest; return to home or school	Family Court	yes
FLORIDA	file complaint in Circuit Court	finding of dependency	arrest; return to home or school	Circuit Court	yes

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
GEORGIA	report to Juvenile Court	finding of unruly or deprived child	arrest during school hours; return to home or school	Juvenile Court	-
HAWAII	-	informal adjustment; protective supervision	-	Family Court	yes
IDAHO	expulsion; petition to District Court	informal disposition; finding of status offence or neglect	arrest; detention for no more than 24 hours	Magistrate Division of District Court	yes
ILLINOIS	alternate classes	finding of neglect	arrest; delivery to proper officials	Circuit Court	yes
INDIANA	report to Juvenile Court	finding of delinquency	arrest without warrant; delivery to school	Juvenile Court	yes
IOWA	alternate classes; penalties at local discretion	-	arrest without warrant and return to teacher	N/A	-
KANSAS	-	finding of child in need of care	-	District Court	-
KENTUCKY	-	status action allows secure detention if no alternatives available	arrest and take into custody	Juvenile Session of District Court	yes
LOUISIANA	refusal to issue grades, suspension, expulsion; report to Juvenile Court	finding of child in need of supervision, delinquency	arrest during school hours; return to school or to receiving centre	Juvenile Court	yes
MAINE	school board hearing	-	arrest and return to school	N/A	yes
MARYLAND	report to superintendent	finding of child in need of supervision	-	Juvenile Court	-

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
MASSACHUSETTS	petition to Juvenile Court	finding of child in need of services or delinquency	arrest without warrant and return to school	Juvenile Court	yes
MICHIGAN	assignment to ungraded school	finding of truancy	powers of deputy sheriff	Juvenile Court	-
MINNESOTA	assignment to ungraded classes, referral to Juvenile Court	finding of habitual truancy	-	-	-
MISSISSIPPI	report to attendance officer; petition to Youth Court	disposition to ensure compliance	find and return child to home	Youth Court	yes
MISSOURI	attendance at special school	finding of child in need of care and treatment	arrest without warrant; placement in school, home or place of detention for neglected children	Juvenile Court	yes
MONTANA	-	finding of youth in need of supervision	arrest and return to school	Youth Court	yes
NEBRASKA	attendance at special school	finding of truancy or neglect	-	Juvenile Court	-
NEVADA	-	finding of child in need of supervision	arrest without warrant; return to school or parent	Juvenile Court	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE	as per local by-laws regarding truants	finding of child in need of services	arrest and return to school	District Court	-
NEW JERSEY	file proceedings in Court	finding of juvenile family crisis	arrest and return to home or school	Superior Court	-

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
NEW MEXICO	report to Childrens' Court	finding of child in need of supervision	-	Childrens' Court	-
NEW YORK	attendance at special school	finding of person in need of supervision or neglected child	arrest without warrant and return to school	Family Court	-
NORTH CAROLINA	-	finding of undisciplined juvenile	arrest and temporary custody	District Court	yes
NORTH DAKOTA	-	finding of unruly child	-	Juvenile Court of District Court	-
OHIO	complaint to Juvenile Court	finding of neglected, unruly, or delinquent child	arrest and conduct child to school	Juvenile Court	-
OKLAHOMA	report to district attorney	finding of delinquency, child in need of supervision or deprived child	-	District Court	-
OREGON	suspension or expulsion	finding of child who is beyond control of parents, or of child whose parents have failed to provide education	-	Juvenile Court	-
PENNSYLVANIA	file proceedings in Juvenile Court	finding of dependency	arrest without warrant and return to school	Juvenile Court	-
RHODE ISLAND	file proceedings in Family Court	finding that child is wayward, delinquency or neglected	arrest and detention for no more than 6 hours	Family Court	yes
SOUTH CAROLINA	loss of course credit; report to court	order compliance; declaration of delinquency or neglect	-	Family Court	yes

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
SOUTH DAKOTA	institute court action	finding of child in need of supervision, neglect	arrest without warrant; return to school	Circuit Court	yes
TENNESSEE	report to superintendent; suspension, attendance at truancy school, deemed disorderly; report to court	finding of unruly child	-	Juvenile Court	yes
TEXAS	refusal to give course credit; disciplinary program; expulsion; file proceedings in court	finding of need for supervision	No	Juvenile Court	yes
UTAH	expulsion or release from school	finding of habitual truancy	arrest; release to school receiving centre	Juvenile Court	yes
VERMONT	local district policy	finding of child in need of supervision	arrest during school hours; return to school	District Court	-
VIRGINIA	file proceedings in Juvenile Court	finding of child in need of services	arrest and return to school	Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court	yes
WASHINGTON	petition to Juvenile Court	arrangement of diversion agreement; order to attend school	arrest; return to parent or school	Juvenile Court	yes
WEST VIRGINIA	-	declaration of delinquency or neglect	-	Circuit Court	yes
WISCONSIN	detention; file proceedings in Juvenile Court	finding of child in need of protective services	-	Juvenile Court	yes

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

Part B of Table (cont'd)

STATE	6				7
	a	b	c	d	
WYOMING	notification of district attorney	finding of child in need of supervision	-	Juvenile Court	-
WASHINGTON, D.C.	-	finding of neglect, delinquency, or child in need of supervision	-	Family Division of Superior Court	-

1 = ages (inclusive) of compulsory education; 2 = ages (inclusive) schools must serve; 3 = exceptions to compulsory attendance laws: a = completion of grade; b = home instruction; c = private schooling; d = work release; e = incapacity; f = local authority; g = other; 4 = appointment and duties of attendance officers; 5 = enforcement against parent: a = notice; b = sanctions; c = court; 6 = enforcement against pupil: a = by school; b = by court; c = arrest; d = court; 7 = statutory alternatives to court action.

APPENDIX G. PERSONS MET WITH, PHONED, OR OTHERWISE CONTACTED IN THE COURSE OF PROGRAMS SURVEY

Albert Aguayo - Assistant Superintendent, Department of Secondary Education, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado.

Robert Algozzine - Special Education, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Gayle H. Anderson - Manager, Education Development Center, Minnesota State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Josephine D. Arasteh - Administrator, Human Learning and Behavior Branch, Center for Research for Mothers and Children, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), Washington, D.C.

George Ayers - President, Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois.

Ibrahim Badawi - Resident in Ambulatory Care, Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa, Ontario

Susan Bailey - Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Robert C. Barnum - Commissioner, Youth Services, Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Topeka, Kansas.

Hilde Beckie - Home Visiting Teacher, Regina Catholic Schools, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Milton Bennett - Coordinator, Attendance, Safety, and Driver Education, Office of Educational Program Development, West Virginia State Department of Education, Charleston, West Virginia.

Ian Berg - Consultant in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Leeds Western Health Authority, Leeds, United Kingdom.

Benjamin J. Bernoudy - Director, Uniform Code of Student Conduct, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

Heather Blackwell - Social Worker, The Board of Education of the Regina School Division, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Joel Bloom - Assistant Commissioner, Division of General Academic Education, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

Donald B. Bolton - Administrator, Student Attendance and Adjustment Services, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Wesley O. Boyd - Coordinator, School Social Work/Education Alternatives, Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

Carol Brock - Inservice Institute Coordinator, Vermont State Department of Education, Montpelier, Vermont.

Frank B. Brouillet - State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington.

Joseph G. Brown - Director, Student Attendance Service Center, D.C. Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Brown - President, 7001 Ltd., Washington, D.C.

Robert F. Brown - Counsellor, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Thunder Bay, Ontario

Deborah Callahan - Specialist, Senior High Schools Options, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Sheila Cameron - Social Worker, London Family Court Clinic, London, Ontario

Sandi Caro - Visiting Teacher, South San Antonio Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas.

Paul Carrier - Social Worker, Family Court Clinic, Ottawa, Ontario.

Anne Carron - Psychologist, Family Court Clinic, Ottawa, Ontario.

Center for Urban Affairs, Chicago, Illinois.

Chicago United, Chicago, Illinois.

Larry Chomin - School Psychologist, Henry Lyster School, Detroit, Michigan.

Cynthia Coates-Hill - Social Worker, D.C. Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Rosalie Cole - Dropout Project, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado.

Armand Colosimo - Attendance Counsellor, The Lakehead District Catholic School Board, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

G. Scott Conrod - Director of Student Services, The Protestant School Board, Montreal, Quebec.

Robert B. Cormier - Chief, Corrections Research, Research Division, Programs Branch, Solicitor General Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Cathy Cox - Department of Research, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas.

Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Del Crabtree - Program Coordinator, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky.

Hugh J. Curtis - Area Service Director, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Jim Davies - Director of Bureau Services, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

David Davis, Jr. - Coordinator, Educational Development Services, Alameda County Office of Education, Hayward, California.

Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State College of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Ralph D. Dickens - Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Richmond Public Schools, Richmond, Virginia.

Terence R. B. Donahoe - Minister of Education, Province of Nova Scotia, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Hank Dorsey - Director of Attendance Service, Child Welfare Office, Berkeley, California.

Barbara Dougherty - The Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin.

Irina Dubrovina - Deputy Director, Institute of General and Paedogogical Psychology, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Dane Edley - Social Worker, Student Attendance Service Center, D.C. Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Roger Edwards - Division of Evaluation and Research, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Marcella G. Egenes - State Attendance Officer, Division of Human Services, Indiana State Department of Education, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Sheldon Ehrlich - Public Relations, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Faculty of Education, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Rilda van Feggelen - Dartmouth District School Board, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

Gerry Fewster - Principal, Special Education Services, Scarborough Board of Education, Scarborough, Ontario.

Sara L. Foulks - Director, Department of School Social Work, New Orleans Public Schools, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Queen D. Fowler - Executive Director, Pupil Personnel Services, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Maryellen Francoeur - Psychologist, Children's Regional Centre of Thunder Bay, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Sylvia Garcia - Education Program Director, Texas Education Agency, Austin Texas.

Lloyd Garmezy - Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Paul E. Gendreau - Psychologist, Rideau Regional Centre, Burritt's Rapids, Ontario.

Thomas A. Giordano - Director of Attendance Services, Buffalo Board of Education, Buffalo, New York.

Tom Grayson - Educational Specialist, Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois.

Rick Grey - Social Worker, Family Court Clinic, Ottawa, Ontario.

Jean Griffin - Educational Reporter, Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Illinois.

Larry Haberlin - Supervisor of Child Care Workers' Services, Vancouver School Board, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Hugh J. Haley - Psychologist, Law School, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Anna Hallrup - Swedish National Board of Education, Stockholm, Sweden.

John Harris - Carver High School, Chicago, Illinois.

Nora Harwell - Assistant Administrator, Henry Lyster School, Detroit, Michigan.

W. Murray Hayes - Regional Coordinator of Special Education, Saskatchewan Education, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Maureen Hemphill - Minister of Education, Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Ronald Henbest - School Social Worker, Bureau Services, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Irene Hill - Project Facilitator, Pilot Attendance Project, Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Larry Hnetka - Communications Coordinator, Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.

John Honan - Judge, Buffalo, New York.

David W. Hornbeck - State Superintendent of Schools, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Ken Horsman - Executive Director, Curriculum Development, Saskatchewan Education, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Dennis Huculak - School Social Worker, Bureau Services, Sector D, Malmo School, Edmonton, Alberta.

Dan M. Isaacs - Assistant Superintendent, Special Projects and Reconfiguration Office, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Peter Jaffe - Director, London Family Court Clinic, London, Ontario.

Gayle Gilchrist James - Edmonton, Alberta.

Olga James-Reid - University of West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.

Kenn Johnson - Ontario Ministry of Education, Toronto, Ontario.

Geoff Jopson - Coordinator of Student Support Services and Counselling, Education Services Group, Vancouver School Board, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Jerome Kagan - Professor, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Cal Kakegumick - Student Counsellor, Boarding Student Program, The Lakehead Board of Education, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Barbara Kardas - Dean, College of Education, Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois.

Ken Keiser - Divisional Assistant, Division of Evaluation and Research, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Don Kinley - School Psychologist, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Fred Koch - President, Jobs for Tennessee Graduates, Memphis, Tennessee.

Ralph H. Kolstoe - Professor, Department of Psychology, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

Pat Kuhi - Chairperson, Alameda County School Attendance Review Board (S.A.R.B.), San Leandro, California.

Charles L. Kyle, Jr. - Chicago, Illinois.

Judith Langdon - Tutorial Outreach, Adult Day School Board of Education for the City of York, Toronto, Ontario

Annmare Law - Coordinator, Center for Dropout Prevention, School of Education, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Mickey Law - Teacher, Lakehead District Roman Separate Catholic School Board, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

David R. Leasure - Pupil Personnel Worker, Office of Pupil Personnel, Baltimore County Public Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.

Sylvia LeBlanc - Psychologist, Family Court Clinic, Ottawa, Ontario.

Alan D. W. Leschied - Assistant Director, London Family Court Clinic, London, Ontario.

Roger Lefrançois - HLA Consultants, Edmonton, Alberta.

Allan H. Lehmann - Coordinator, Bureau of Dropout Prevention Programs, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, Illinois.

James D. Lehmann - Executive Deputy Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas.

Min Leong - Staff Specialist, Pupil Services, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Wilma Lewis - School Social Worker, Henry Lyster School, Detroit, Michigan.

Jack D. Little - Director of Education and Secretary, The Board of Education for the City of London, London, Ontario.

Peter Little - Student Placement Office, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Vladimir Lyubovsky - Special Educator, Institute of Defectology, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Lee Lundberg - Supervisor, Attendance and Support Services, San Leandro Unified School District, San Leandro, California.

Mervin D. Lynch - Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

John Martinez - Program Coordinator, Southside Truancy Outreach Program, San Antonio, Texas.

Pete Martinez - Dropout Prevention Coordinator, Dropout Task Force, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Richard E. Maurer - Principal, Anne M. Dorner Middle School, Ossining, New York.

Greg McClare - Child Social Worker, Toronto Board of Education, Toronto, Ontario.

Gordon McClure - Principal, M. R. McHugh School, Ottawa Board of Education, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dale McCollough - Training and Employment Development Division, Texas Department of Community Affairs, Austin, Texas.

Alice McDonald - Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky.

Sheila McDonald - Teacher, Ottawa Board of Education, Ottawa, Ontario.

Robert L. McElrath - Commissioner, Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee.

Floretta D. McKenzie - Superintendent of Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Florence McKie - Curriculum-Special Needs Programs, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

David McLean - Psychologist, Family Court Clinic, Ottawa, Ontario.

Al McLeod - Assistant Superintendent of Student and Community Services, Scarborough Board of Education, Scarborough, Ontario.

Jim McNeirney - Consultant, Public Information Services, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado.

Knud Michelsen - Deputy Head, International Relations Division, Ministry of Education, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Ruth Michelson - School Social Worker, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction Générale des Régions, Quebec City, Quebec.

Joell Mohan - School Social Worker, Bureau Services, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Oliver C. Moles - Acting Head, Division of Education and Society, Office for Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C.

Don Moore - Designs for Change, Chicago, Illinois.

Dan Morris - College of Education, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

Joe Morrison - Superintendent of Operations, Halifax County School System, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

T. S. Nisbet - Attendance Counsellor, Lakehead Board of Education, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Jan Novak - The Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin.

Marth O'Kelley - Attendance Officer, Kelly Miller Junior High School, D.C. Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Laurie Olsen - The Citizens Policy Center, Inc., Oakland, California.

Don Olweus - Institute of Personality Psychology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.

Nancy L. Peck - Director, Center for Dropout Prevention, School of Education, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Tony Piotta - Teacher, St. Elizabeth School, Lakehead District Roman Catholic Separate School Board, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

John Pisapia - Assistant State Superintendent, Program and Instruction, The Board of Education of the Regina School Division, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Jerry Powers - Director, Division of Evaluation and Research, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Gene Provenzo - Professor, School of Education and Allied Professions, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Leroy Pulliam - Principal, Alternative Program, Newark Unified School District, Newark, California.

Glenn Purcell - Chief Attendance Counsellor, Student and Community Services, Scarborough Board of Education, Scarborough, Ontario.

Herbert C. Quay - Chairman, Department of Psychology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

J. Gilberto Quezada - Manager of Special Programs, South San Antonio Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas.

Cary Reichard - Professor, Special Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Barbara Reid - Attendance Counsellor, Lakehead Board of Education, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Marge Reitsma-Street - Graduate Student, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

Rodney Riffel - Program Manager, Job Training, National Conference of State Legislatures, Washington, D.C.

Lee Robins - Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

John W. Rogers - Provincial School Attendance Counsellor, Ontario Ministry of Education, Toronto, Ontario.

Joseph Rosen - Former Executive Director, Illinois Task Force on Children Out of School, Chicago, Illinois.

Bernice L. Rosman - Director, Training, Research, and Evaluation, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mel Rottenberg - Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C.

Bob Saigh - Information Director, Office of Communication, Chicago Board of Education, Chicago, Illinois.

Perry Sailor - Evaluation Associate, Austin Independent School District, Austin, Texas.

John Samborsky - Consultant, Attendance and Counselling, Student and Special Services, Board of Education for the City of Etobicoke, Etobicoke, Ontario.

Thomas Sanabria - Coordinator, Network for Youth Services, Chicago, Illinois.

George Sanders - Department of Education, Appalachian Regional Staff, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Washington, D.C.

Doris H. Sanders - Director, School Attendance, Work Permits, Census, District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

Peggy Sange - Technical Assistant, Disruptive Youth Program, State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Ed Scheibler - Education Counsellor, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Peter Schifferli - Court Liaison-Attendance Teacher, Buffalo Board of Education, Buffalo, New York.

Karen Shapiro - Graduate Student, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.

Arthur G. Shaw - Special Assistant to the Executive Vice-President, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

S. A. Sheffield - Director, Inspection Services, Nova Scotia Department of Education, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Ernest Shelton - Guidance Counselor, Henry Lyster School, Detroit, Michigan.

Joe Sherron - Supervisor, Career Education, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.

Kenneth D. Sjoen - School Safety, Law Enforcement Specialist, National School Safety Center, Sacramento, California.

Robert Smilanich - Associate Superintendent, Consulting Services, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

James R. Smith - Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instructional Leadership, California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California.

Sandra Smith - Director, Legislative Services, Alberta Education, Edmonton, Alberta.

Joan Solomon - Director of Urban Education, Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Velma Speight - Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Compensatory, Urban, and Supplementary Programs, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rita Spivey - Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C.

Julie Starsiak - Aide to Illinois State Representative Al Roman (member of the Illinois State Legislative Task Force), Chicago, Illinois.

Steven J. Stein - Research Psychologist, Thistletown Regional Centre, Toronto, Ontario.

Gayle Stewart - School Social Worker, Bureau Services, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton, Alberta.

Michael Stott - Child Mental Health Clinic, Department of Youth Services, County of Erie, Buffalo, New York.

Student Services, Atlanta Board of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

Keith Sullivan - Professor, Education Department, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Josephine Thomas - Acting Coordinator in Secondary Education, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado.

Terry Thomas - Director, Department of Pupil Personnel Services, Oakland Schools, Pontiac, Michigan.

Hershel Thornburg - Editor, Journal of Early Adolescence, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Robert Tobias - Administrator of Evaluation, Office of Educational Assessment, New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, New York.

Mavis Tremblay - Social Worker, The Board of Education of the Regina School Division, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Linda Trenton - Management Information Co-ordinator, Department of Education, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Michael Tripp - Attendance Counselor, Eastern High School, Washington, D.C.

Carol Urquhart - Pine Mountain Settlement School, Bledsoe, Kentucky.

Jan Valentine - Social Worker, Student Attendance Service Center, D.C. Public Schools, Washington, D.C.

M. C. A. van Gign-deJong - Ministry of Education, The Netherlands.

Anna Venable - Counselor Liaison, Detroit Attendance Intervention Centers, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

Mary P. Vereen - Supervisor, Dropout Prevention Program, Student Services, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.

Adolf J. Volk - Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, Regina Catholic Schools, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Thelma Vriend - Program Coordinator, Detroit Attendance Intervention Centers, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

Samuel A. Wallace - Coordinator, Health/Social Services, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

Norman Walsh - Associate Superintendent, Division of Evaluation and Research, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

Dave Westerback - Psychometrist, Children's Regional Centre of Thunder Bay, Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Rod A. Wickstrom - Deputy Minister, Saskatchewan Education, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Charlie G. Williams - State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina State Department of Education, Columbia, South Carolina.

Wayne Willis - Social Worker, London Family Court Clinic, London, Ontario.

Linda Wilson - Coordinator, Student Attendance and Adjustment Services, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.

Kym Wolfe - Director, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, London, Ontario.

Sandy Wood - Administrative Assistant, Division of Evaluation and Research, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.

M. C. George Yang - Coordinator, Attendance and Welfare, New Haven Unified School District, Union City, California.

Joseph M. Yurkiw - Supervisor, Adjustment Services Department, Board of Education for the City of Hamilton, Hamilton, Ontario.

Harvey Zingle - Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Barbara Zvonar - Teacher, Ottawa Board of Education, Ottawa, Ontario.